97-84205-3

National Union of Conservative...

Fiscal questions

[Westminster]

[1905?]

97-84205-3
MASTER NEGATIVE #

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
PRESERVATION DIVISION

BIBLIOGRAPHIC MICROFORM TARGET

ORIGINAL MATERIAL AS FILMED - EXISTING BIBLIOGRAPHIC RECORD

```
OCLC:  37516189          Rec stat:    n
Entered:    19970822     Replaced:    19970822      Used:    19970822
Type:  a    ELvl:  K     Srce:  d     Audn:         Ctrl:       Lang:  eng
BLvl:  m    Form:  a     Conf:  0     Biog:         MRec:       Ctry:  enk
            Cont:        GPub:        Fict:  0      Indx:  0
Desc:  a    Ills:        Fest:  0     DtSt:  s      Dates: 1905,     ↔
  1  040     PR1 ▾c PR1 ↔
  2  007     h ▾b d ▾d a ▾e f ▾f a--- ▾g b ▾h a ▾i c ▾j p ↔
  3  007     h ▾b d ▾d a ▾e f ▾f a--- ▾g b ▾h a ▾i a ▾j p ↔
  4  007     h ▾b d ▾d a ▾e f ▾f a--- ▾g b ▾h a ▾i b ▾j p ↔
  5  049     PR1A ↔
  6  110 2   National Union of Conservative and Constitutional Associations. ↔
  7  245 10  Fiscal questions / ▾c National Union of Conservative and
Constitutional Associations. ↔
  8  260     [Westminster : ▾b Conservative Publications Dept., ▾c ca.
1905?] ↔
  9  300     1 v. (various pagings) ; ▾c 21 cm. ↔
 10  440  0  General election. Leaflets-election series ↔
 11  500     Cover title. ↔
 12  500     Collection of numbered National Union and Conservative Central
Office pamphlets on fiscal questions, bound together after publication. ↔
```

RESTRICTIONS ON USE: *Reproductions may not be made without permission from Columbia University Libraries.*

TECHNICAL MICROFORM DATA

FILM SIZE: 35mm REDUCTION RATIO: 10:1 IMAGE PLACEMENT: IA (IIA) IB IIB

DATE FILMED: 10-1-97 INITIALS: PB

TRACKING # : 23082

FILMED BY PRESERVATION RESOURCES, BETHLEHEM, PA.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC IRREGULARITIES

MAIN ENTRY: National Union of Conservative and Constitutional Associations

Fiscal questions

Bibliographic Irregularities in the Original Document:

List all volumes and pages affected; include name of institution if filming borrowed text.

____ Page(s) missing/not available: _____

____ Volume(s) missing/not available: _____

____ Illegible and/or damaged page(s): _____

_____

____ Page(s) or volume(s) misnumbered: _____

____ Bound out of sequence: _____

____ Page(s) or volume(s) filmed from copy borrowed from: _____

_____

X various pagings throughout pamphlet

____ Other: _____

_____

____ Inserted material: _____

TRACKING#: MSH23082

NATIONAL UNION

OF

CONSERVATIVE AND CONSTITUTIONAL ASSOCIATIONS.

HEAD OFFICE:

ST. STEPHEN'S CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

GENERAL ELECTION.

LEAFLETS—ELECTION SERIES.

FISCAL QUESTIONS.

4 page Leaflets	...	4/6 per 1,000	... 8d. per 100.
2 „ Leaflets	...	3/6 per 1,000	... 6d. per 100.
1 „ Leaflets	...	2/6 per 1,000	... 4d. per 100.

Orders for Leaflets should be addressed to the Secretary, National Union, St. Stephen's Chambers, Westminster, S.W.

It is unnecessary to give the name of the Leaflet, the number being sufficient.

A complete set of the Leaflets in this section can be obtained on application, post free 3*d.* each.

National Union Gleanings.

A FEW PRESS OPINIONS.

The Times.

A contribution to campaign literature on the Unionist side which should prove **of great service to all Unionist politicians.**

Morning Post.

All who value the integrity of that vast Empire will appreciate the "Gleanings" for the variety and point of their contents, and the keenness and vigour with which they advocate the great cause of national union and individual freedom.

The Saturday Review.

The work of making these "Gleanings" has been thoroughly done. Every political event of any importance which has occurred in the period chosen by the compilers is carefully recorded, and the most useful parts of the speeches made on both sides are quoted at length. It will be seen that this is **an indispensable book for the leading article writer and the politician.** Both will be saved a great deal of trouble by having under their hand a work of reference which will give them so much useful information in an accessible form.

Sheffield Daily Telegraph.

A perfect magazine of information on all public questions which have to be dealt with in Parliament as well as the extra-Parliamentary utterances of prominent men, with newspaper and magazine comment thereon.

(C.C.O.—No. 486.)

FISCAL RECIPROCITY.

The Conservative and Unionist Policy.

RETALIATION AT WORK.

Radicals have three objections to the Conservative and Unionist policy of Retaliation. They say:—

(1.) That it cannot be effective.

(2.) That it would injure us more than Foreign Nations.

(3.) That Foreign Nations would be offended.

These statements are not true.

HERE ARE SOME PROOFS:—

In 1860, Mr. COBDEN was able to arrange a commercial treaty with France, greatly to the benefit of our Exports. **We had something to bargain with in those days.**

A year or two ago, France and Italy reduced their tariffs on each other's goods.

INTENTIONAL SECOND EXPOSURE

National Union Gleanings.

A FEW PRESS OPINIONS.

The Times.

A contribution to campaign literature on the Unionist side which should prove **of great service to all Unionist politicians.**

Morning Post.

All who value the integrity of that vast Empire will appreciate the "Gleanings" for the variety and point of their contents, and the keenness and vigour with which they advocate the great cause of national union and unity and freedom.

The Saturday Review.

The work of making these "Gleanings" has been thoroughly done. Every political event of any importance which has occurred in the period chosen by the compilers is carefully recorded, and the most useful parts of the speeches made on both sides are quoted at length. It will be seen that this is **an indispensable book for the leading article writer and the politician.** Both will be saved a great deal of trouble by having under their hand a work of reference which will give them so much useful information in an accessible form.

Sheffield Daily Telegraph.

A perfect magazine of information on all public questions which have to be dealt with in Parliament, as well as the extra-Parliamentary utterances of prominent men, with newspaper and magazine comment thereon.

(C.C.O.—No. 486.)

FISCAL RECIPROCITY.

The Conservative and Unionist Policy.

RETALIATION AT WORK.

Radicals have three objections to the Conservative and Unionist policy of Retaliation. They say:—

(1.) That it cannot be effective.

(2.) That it would injure us more than Foreign Nations.

(3.) That Foreign Nations would be offended.

These statements are not true.

HERE ARE SOME PROOFS:—

In 1860, Mr. COBDEN was able to arrange a commercial treaty with France, greatly to the benefit of our Exports. **We had something to bargain with in those days.**

A year or two ago, France and Italy reduced their tariffs on each other's goods.

Germany has a very high tariff which she uses to bargain with. Practically all countries have bargained with Germany. **Her high tariff persuaded them.**

The United States told LORD LANSDOWNE that they had a right to make special tariff arrangements with any country they pleased.

Is Retaliation an effective policy? Would it injure us? Would Foreign countries take it badly?

No. They would be ready to come to terms. They cannot afford to quarrel with us. We are the best customer of the United States, Germany, France and Spain; the second best of Russia, Austria-Hungary and Holland; the third best of Belgium.

The Conservatives and Unionists ask you to give them something to bargain with—the Power of Retaliation. It is the way to get fair trade; in fact, it is the only way to secure REAL Free Trade.

Issued by the Conservative Publication Department, St. Stephen's Chambers, Westminster, S.W., in connection with the Conservative Central Office and National Union.
McConquodale & Co. Ltd., Printers, "The Armoury," London, S.E.

(C.C.O. No. 488.)

THE

FISCAL POLICY

OF THE

CONSERVATIVE

AND

UNIONIST PARTY

DOES NOT INCLUDE

A TAX ON FOOD.

It will **NOT RAISE** the price of bread.

It will **NOT** make the loaf any smaller.

It will **NOT INCREASE** the cost of living.

But it **WILL DO AWAY** with unfair foreign trade.

It **WILL** make the way for our exports easier.

It is **NOT** a policy of Protection.

It **IS** a policy to secure real

FREE TRADE.

Published by the Conservative Publication Department, St. Stephen's Chambers, Westminster, S.W., in connection with the Conservative Central Office and the National Union. (B. 5.)
Printed by SIR JOSEPH CAUSTON & SONS, LIMITED, 9, Eastcheap, London, E.C.

INTENTIONAL SECOND EXPOSURE

Germany has a very high tariff which she uses to bargain with. Practically all countries have bargained with Germany. **Her high tariff persuaded them.**

The United States told LORD LANSDOWNE that they had a right to make special tariff arrangements with any country they pleased.

Is Retaliation an effective policy? Would it injure us? Would Foreign countries take it badly?

No. They would be ready to come to terms. They cannot afford to quarrel with us. We are the best customer of the United States, Germany, France and Spain; the second best of Russia, Austria-Hungary and Holland; the third best of Belgium.

The Conservatives and Unionists ask you to give them something to bargain with—the Power of Retaliation. It is the way to get fair trade; in fact, it is the only way to secure REAL Free Trade.

Issued by the Conservative Publication Department, St. Stephen's Chambers, Westminster, S.W., in connection with the Conservative Central Office and National Union.
McCorquodale & Co. Ltd., Printers, "The Armoury," London, S.E.

(C.C.O. No. 488.)

THE

FISCAL POLICY

OF THE

CONSERVATIVE

AND

UNIONIST PARTY

DOES NOT INCLUDE

A TAX ON FOOD.

It will **NOT RAISE** the price of bread.

It will **NOT** make the loaf any smaller.

It will **NOT INCREASE** the cost of living.

But it **WILL DO AWAY** with unfair foreign trade.

It **WILL** make the way for our exports easier.

It is **NOT** a policy of Protection.

It **IS** a policy to secure real

FREE TRADE.

Published by the Conservative Publication Department, St. Stephen's Chambers, Westminster, S.W., in connection with the Conservative Central Office and the National Union. (B. 5.)
Printed by SIR JOSEPH CAUSTON & SONS, LIMITED, 9, Eastcheap, London, E.C.

N.U.—No. 490.

OUR FISCAL SYSTEM

Twenty reasons why Negotiation and Retaliation are imperative.

1.—**BECAUSE** the policy we adopted nearly sixty years ago, under the belief that it would soon be the policy of all other nations, has become, in the light of the vast changes which have since taken place, utterly inappropriate to modern conditions of international trade. To cling to an unmodified policy of free imports, while every other country becomes increasingly protective, is to be left behind in the race of commerce, and means the loss of our fair share of the trade of the world.

2.—**BECAUSE** we need real Free Trade. To call our system of **Free Imports** one of Free Trade is a misuse of terms. So far from being free, it consists, where our exporting is concerned, of a mass of restrictions which hamper our trade at every turn, and seriously diminish the demand for the labour of British workmen.

3.—**BECAUSE,** although our present system might have been the right one to keep if it had become universal, now that it remains that of Great Britain alone in a Protectionist world, it is a source of weakness and lays us open to grave injury. While our market is free to foreign countries, affording them the large British as well as their home market to produce for, these foreign countries not only supplant British manufactures here, but cripple the sale of our goods abroad.

4.—**BECAUSE** other countries have contrived, by keeping out or restricting imports, to raise up and foster

home industries. As a result of their policy of levying immense duties on our manufactures, our exports of finished goods to the chief foreign countries are fast declining, and it becomes more and more difficult to find a market for our output.

5.—**BECAUSE** of these unfair conditions we have lost the position we once had, that of the first industrial country in the world. Those who formerly depended on our manufactures have now become our source of supply. There exists at present a colossal demand for such things as iron, steel, refined sugar, lace, woollens and other goods which Great Britain is as well able to supply as any land, and it is due to excessive foreign tariffs that our exports of these things are steadily declining. Other countries are absorbing what should fall to us.

6.—**BECAUSE,** now that the cost of production is principally regulated by the amount produced, a limited market is the greatest handicap possible to a manufacturing country. The foreign manufacturer has two safe markets he can count on—his own and ours—but we have no safe market—abroad or at home. The larger your output, the cheaper your relative cost.

7.—**BECAUSE** the security of the manufacturing conditions of other nations, by giving scope for extension and enterprise in all directions, has given them a power which places them beyond the competition of a country labouring under such disadvantages as Great Britain.

8.—**BECAUSE** we should be able to claim from foreign countries some consideration for the advantages our free market affords them. Where such consideration is refused we ought to have power to resort to retaliation until they concede us fairer terms. No real freedom of trade is consistent with high tariffs. Yet they will remain while we are without power to bargain for their reduction.

9.—**BECAUSE** a country in Great Britain's position, without privileges to offer or favours to withhold, cannot expect to obtain justice when it is a question of bargaining. Therefore we must resume those powers, that we may go armed to negotiation with the foreigners—with, as Mr. Balfour has said, "something in our hands to give which they value, and something to take away which they would regret."

10.—**BECAUSE** adopting the power to retaliate would not, as the over-timid appear to think, be a signal for a general war of tariffs. Our custom is so valuable and of so much importance to other nations that they could not afford to treat lightly any proposals we might make. Probably a mere threat would be enough.

11.—**BECAUSE** so helpless is our present position that we had to stand passive and watch, without power to retaliate, the gross injustice of the punishment inflicted by a foreign country on one of our colonies when she took steps to give us preferential treatment.

12.—**BECAUSE** the British workman and the British manufacturer have to compete against the manufactures of foreign sweated industries. The British workman is protected against insanitary workshops and "sweating" by Acts of Parliament and "Fair Wages clauses," yet we import free the productions of the foreign sweated workman.

13.—**BECAUSE** the "illegitimate" cheapness caused by foreign underselling and "dumping" is not benefit enough, even while it lasts, to outweigh the injury and loss to the British workmen and the British trade concerned. And it will last but a short time: when the foreigner once gains a hold on our market by systematic underselling, he will raise his prices, and the consumer will consequently suffer.

14.—**BECAUSE** the foreign systems of extreme Protection have been fostering the development of powerful trusts and combinations abroad.

15.—**BECAUSE** these trusts and combinations keep up prices in their own protected market, of which they have the monopoly, disposing of their surplus manufactures elsewhere (namely, in Great Britain, the only country

whose fiscal policy allows it), finding a ready market for it by deliberately underselling.

16.—**BECAUSE** the assumption that labour displaced by ruined industries is merely diverted to other channels, is a delusion. Of the workmen thus turned out of employment, a percentage must gravitate to the workhouse, too old to start afresh and learn new trades; or, having had some special suitability for that one occupation, useless for another. Skilled mechanics have in many cases to turn to rough labour as a last resource, and the displaced labourer is compelled to join the unemployed. The ruination of any industry cannot come about without injury and loss to hundreds.

17.—**BECAUSE** pauperism and distress, through lack of employment, are on the increase. British manufactures are being displaced by foreign ones. British manufacturers, consequently, are being ruined, and with them goes the employment they gave. The working man's position nowadays is, to say the least of it, an anxious one. Nor can there be any permanent improvement made in it till measures are taken to defend our home industries.

18.—**BECAUSE** the remedy is not to be found in improved Education, of any sort. Education is of no avail against 160 per cent. foreign tax on British exports.

19.—**BECAUSE** the benefits we are supposed to derive from the "most favoured nation" treatment are so manipulated as to afford no advantage.

20.—**BECAUSE** the exercise of the power to retaliate will bring about the reduction of the existing foreign prohibitive tariffs, to the lasting gain and advantage of British trade and industry.

VOTE FOR the UNIONIST CANDIDATE

AND

FISCAL REFORM.

Published by the Conservative Publication Department, St. Stephen's Chambers, Westminster, S.W. in connection with the National Union and the Conservative Central Office. (201)

Printed by George Berridge & Co., 174, Upper Thames Street, London, E.C.

N.U.—No. 491.

Great Britain's Fiscal System

THE UNIONIST PARTY AND THE WORKING CLASSES.

THE DRAWBACKS OF THE EXISTING SYSTEM AND THE REFORMS THE UNIONIST PARTY DESIRE.

UNDER THE PRESENT SYSTEM:

INDUSTRIAL DECAY.

The prosperity of many of our industries is gone – others are being threatened, and Great Britain is fast losing her place at the head of the manufacturing countries of the world.

Foreigners may swamp the British market with their manufactures, duty free, whilst British manufactures are everywhere obstructed by Foreign Protective Tariffs.

Employment and wages, and the resulting prosperity which should fall to British workmen, go to the protected foreign workmen.

WHAT IS THE RESULT?

British industries have been ruined; British trade is stagnant; British workmen are being turned out of employment in increasing numbers; the savings of the British workmen are less than those of the foreigner; Pauperism in Great Britain is on the increase.

THE UNIONIST PARTY WOULD PROVIDE

A CHECK TO THESE EVILS

By resuming a system of negotiating with, and retaliating upon, those Foreign Countries which refuse us fair terms.

THE REVIVAL OF OUR DECAYING INDUSTRIES.

Under the present system foreign-made goods are allowed free access to our home market, while our manufactures are hindered, and sometimes entirely prohibited, by foreign duties, from finding a compensating place in markets abroad. Having thus maimed our exporting and crippled our production, foreign countries take advantage of our free importing system to supplant our manufactures in the home market with their own.

The Unionist Party would alter this one-sided state of commerce by negotiating with our foreign rivals for fairer treatment, by offering them privileges for privileges received, and restrictions for restrictions imposed.

THE RECOVERY OF OUR EXPORT TRADE.

Under the present system our exports of British manufactures to the principal foreign countries are **decreasing**, while theirs to us are increasing.

The Unionist Party wish to correct this disastrous condition of trade by setting our dealings with foreign countries on a more equal footing.

THE DEFENCE OF OUR HOME MARKET.

Under the present system our open market is the foreigner's opportunity to sell in Great Britain below cost price what he cannot dispose of in his own country. The results are disastrous to British manufacturers.

The Unionist Party would take measures to defend Great Britain against such unfair invasion by putting retaliatory duties on the foreign competing goods.

THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE WORKMAN'S CONDITION.

Under the present system factories and mills are being run half-time or closed for weeks at a stretch, and employment is becoming more and more uncertain.

The Unionist Party desire to make secure the position of our industries, and so to ensure constant and increasing employment to the working classes.

THE RECOVERY OF OUR MANUFACTURING SUPREMACY.

Under the present system things are going from bad to worse. By clinging to our system of so-called Free Trade (which is not free at all except in the sense of giving free markets to our foreign competitors), we are falling farther behind every year in these days of fierce commercial competition.

The Unionist Party would re-assert those rights and powers of which we have deprived ourselves, and restore to Great Britain her manufacturing position among the nations of the world.

THE ATTAINMENT OF REAL FREE TRADE.

Under the present system of "Free Imports," Great Britain has not unrestricted commerce even with her own Colonies. Foreign Protectionist countries can claim that advantage. They, at least, can boast of freedom of trade within their own dominions.

The Unionist Party desire to see these inconsistencies removed, and a policy of real free trade substituted.

THE POWER TO NEGOTIATE COMMERCIAL TREATIES.

Under the present system Great Britain is severely handicapped in the making of commercial treaties. With no favours to confer and no power to threaten reprisals, she is not likely to obtain conditions advantageous to herself.

The Unionist Party would recover the weapon of retaliation, and secure for Great Britain recognition and justice in all commercial dealings

THE PROFITABLE EMPLOYMENT OF BRITISH CAPITAL

Under the present system in many instances capital which should have afforded employment to British workmen has found more profitable investment abroad owing to the unfair competition of foreign protected manufactures in the home market. Employment, therefore, which under normal conditions would have fallen to British hands, goes to the working classes of foreign countries.

The Unionist Party, by making secure the British market, seek to remove the cause of this drifting abroad of British capital to employ foreign labour.

VOTE FOR THE UNIONIST CANDIDATE.

Published by the Conservative Publication Department, St. Stephen's Chambers, Westminster, S.W., in connection with the National Union and the Conservative Central Office. (201.)

Printed by George Berridge & Co., 174, Upper Thames Street, London, E.C.

RICHARD COBDEN,
The Apostle of Free Trade.

Interesting quotations from his speeches and writings.

False prophecies regarding universal Free Trade.

"**I believe** that if you abolish the Corn Law honestly and adopt Free Trade in its simplicity, **there will not be a tariff in Europe that will not be changed in less than five years** to follow your example."—*Speech at Manchester, Jan.* 15, 1846. (*Speeches of Richard Cobden, Vol. I., page* 360.)

"They (other nations) will shortly see a second Protectionist Government repudiate Protectionist principles. Then will commence the influence of our example upon foreign countries. **I do not shrink from avowing my belief in the universal** though tardy **triumph of a principle** which has been demonstrated in our own case to involve the well-being of the people and the prosperity of the Government."—*Address to the Electors of the West Riding, June* 24, 1852. (*Reminiscences of Richard Cobden, page* 186.)

False prophecies regarding the effect.

"I speak my unfeigned conviction . . . when I say I believe there is no interest in this country that would receive so much benefit from the repeal of the Corn Laws as the farmer-tenant interest in this country. And I believe that when the future historian comes to write the history of agriculture, he will have to state:—'In such a year there

was a stringent Corn Law passed for the protection of agriculture. From that time agriculture slumbered in England, and it was not until, by the aid of the Anti-Corn Law League, the Corn Law was utterly abolished, that agriculture sprung up to the full vigour of existence in England, to become what it now is, like her manufactures, unrivalled in the world.'"—*Speech at Manchester, Oct.* 24, 1844. (*Speeches of Richard Cobden, Vol. I., pages* 221-2.)

"I maintain that the value of land will ultimately be higher under a system of Free Trade than it ever could have been under Protection."—*Speech in House of Commons, March* 8, 1849 (*Speeches of Richard Cobden, Vol. I., page* 409.)

The object that has not been achieved.

"The Free Traders have only had one object in view, the removal of those restrictions which impede the progress of commercial intercourse between the different nations of the earth."—*Speech at Genoa, Jan.* 16, 1847. (*Reminiscences of Richard Cobden, page* 44.)

The necessity for reviewing our position.

"If, as has lately been shewn in England, at certain periods in the history of a nation, it becomes necessary to review its principles of domestic policy for the purpose of adapting the Government to the changing and improving condition of its people—**it must be equally the part of a wise community to alter the maxims by which its foreign relations have, in past times, been regulated in conformity with the changes that have taken place over the entire globe."**—*Advertisement to "Russia,"* 1836. (*Cobden's Political Writings, Vol. I., page* 157.)

"The true test of the worthiness of a people to enjoy free institutions is their capacity, by timely and wise amendments, to adapt them to the changing and advancing circumstances of the age."—*Address to the Electors of the West Riding, June* 24, 1852. (*Reminiscences of Richard Cobden, page* 185.)

Progress is vital.

"We must not stand still, or imagine that we can remain stereotyped, like the Chinese; for **if we ever cease to progress be assured we shall commence to decline."**—*Speech at Manchester, Oct.* 25, 1862. (*Speeches of Richard Cobden, Vol. II., page* 303.)

Cobden's contempt for our Colonial system.

"The Colonial system, with all its dazzling appeals to the passions of the people, **can never be got rid of except by the indirect process of free trade,** which will gradually and imperceptibly loose the bonds which unite our Colonies to us by a mistaken notion of self-interest."—*Letter to Mr. Ashworth, April* 12, 1842. (*Morley's Life of Richard Cobden, Vol. I., page* 231.)

"We have, I think, **unfortunately for ourselves,** about a hundred times the amount of territory beyond the seas to protect, as colonies and dependencies, that France has."—*Speech at Rochdale, June* 26, 1861. (*Speeches of Richard Cobden, Vol. II., p.* 248.)

"We (the Canadians and the English) are two peoples to all intents and purposes, and it is a perilous delusion to both parties to attempt to keep up a sham connexion and dependence which will snap asunder if it should ever be put to the strain of stern reality. . . . In my opinion, **it is for the interest of both that we should as speedily as possible sever the political thread by which we are as communities connected,** and leave the individuals on both sides to cultivate the relations of commerce and friendly intercourse, as with other nations. I have felt an interest in this confederation scheme, because I thought it was a step in the direction of an amicable settlement."—*Letter to Colonel Cole, March* 20, 1865. (*Morley's Life of Richard Cobden, Vol. II., page* 470.)

"To confess the truth, I have no heart for discussing any of the **details** of Indian management, for I look on our rule there, as a whole, with an eye of despair. . . . It is, however, from an abiding conviction in my mind that we have entered upon an impossible and hopeless career in India, that I can never bring my mind to take an interest in

the details of its government."—*Letter to Mr. W. Hargreaves, Aug. 4, 1860. (Morley's Life of Richard Cobden, Vol. II., page 360.)*

Cobden's contempt for the small trader.

"When I am talking over the reduction of duties with M. Rouher, and we come to some small industry employing a few hands and a little capital, which has put in its claim for high protection, I am in the habit of suggesting to him that rather than interfere with the trade of the country for the purpose of feeding and clothing these small protected interests, he had better withdraw the parties from their unprofitable occupations, take some handsome apartments for them in the Louvre Hotel, and feast them on venison and champagne at the country's expense for the rest of their days."—*Letter to Mr. Ashworth, Aug. 27, 1860. (Morley's Life of Richard Cobden, Vol. II., page 362.)*

Cobden's contempt for the working classes

"You may probably tell me that though we have the electors of the great constituencies I have mentioned in our favour, the great mass of the people are not with us. That is a rather democratic sentiment. You never heard me quote the superior judgment of the working classes in any deliberation in this assembly. You never heard me cant about the superior claims of the working classes to arbitrate on this great question."—*Speech in House of Commons, Feb. 27, 1846. (Speeches of Richard Cobden, Vol. I., pages 371–2.)*

"Depend upon it, **nothing can be got by fraternizing with trades unions.** They are founded upon principles of brutal tyranny and monopoly. **I would rather live under a Dey of Algiers than a Trades Committee.**"—*Letter to F. W. Cobden, Aug. 16, 1842. (Morley's Life of Richard Cobden, Vol. I., page 299.)*

A resolution which has benefited the Foreigner

"We resolved to restrain the functions of our legislation within their proper limits by withdrawing from it altogether the power of regulating or protecting commerce, and leaving every individual free to exercise his industry in whatever way he pleased. This was the object of the League, which it accomplished after a struggle of seven years."—*Speech at Cadiz, Nov. 9, 1846. (Reminiscences of Richard Cobden, page 32.)*

Published by the Conservative Publication Department, St. Stephen's Chambers, Westminster, S.W., in connection with the National Union and the Conservative Central Office (204).
Printed by George Beiridge & Co., 74, Upper Thames Street, London, E.C.

N.U.—No. 493.

FISCAL POLICY & BRITISH TRADE

RADICAL OPINIONS.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, M.P.

(The Radical Prime Minister.)

"In this country we know, thanks to the patience and accurate scientific investigations of Mr. Rowntree and Mr. Charles Booth, that **there is about 30 per cent. of our population underfed, on the verge of hunger. Thirty per cent. of 41 millions comes to something over 12 millions**—almost identical, as you see, with the whole population of the Colonies. So that it comes to this, that for every man in the Colonies who is benefited, one head is shoved under water in this country. I think I might set down that fact as almost enough of itself to condemn any scheme, however plausible. Surely **the fact that about 30 per cent. of the population is living in the grip of perpetual poverty is, or ought to be, a sufficient answer to the Prime Minister's complacent suggestion that we can now afford to try experiments** which fifty years ago were not to be thought of. . . ."—*Speech at Perth.—Daily News, June 6, 1903.*

The EARL OF ROSEBERY, K.G.

(Prime Minister in the Radical Administration of 1894-5.)

"There are committees and commissions of inquiry without end. Some are indefinitely postponed, but some are pressing and immediate. Surely **an inquiry might be well instituted** which might be short, which might be practical, and which might be exhaustive, **into the causes of the decline of British trade and the alarming increase of our foreign rivals.**"—*Speech at Epsom.—Times, July 25, 1896.*

"I am not inattentive to the changes and developments in the world of commerce, so startling, so sudden and so overwhelming, that they may readily induce anyone to reconsider many of his fiscal beliefs. . . . **I do not say that Free Trade is a fetish, a religious dogma, which must be accepted and applied on all occasions without consideration or reservation.**"—*Speech in Leeds—Times, May 31, 1902.*

"He was not a person who believed that Free Trade was part of the Sermon on the Mount, and that we ought to receive it in all its rigidity as a divinely appointed Dispensation."—*Speech at Burnley.—Times, May 20, 1903.*

"Free Trade was made for man—not man for Free Trade—and I hold—and Mr. Cobden held—that it is the right of the nation, and

it is the duty of the nation, to review from time to time all its arrangements, with a view to considering whether they cannot be improved or revised."—*Speech to the Liberal League in London.—Daily Chronicle, June* 13, 1903.

The late Sir WILLIAM V. HARCOURT, M.P.

(Chancellor of the Exchequer in the Radical Ministry, 1892-5.)

". . . No doubt we want higher education in all classes of the community; but **I believe it is an entire mistake** to affirm that any falling off in British trade is due to any inferiority either in the manufacturers or the artisans of this country. At this time it is admitted that all the best goods are made in the United Kingdom. . . Where British trade has fallen off, and where other competitors have come in, it has not been from the inferiority of British goods." —*Speech at Dundee.—Dundee Advertiser, Nov.* 26, 1897.

"There never was greater nonsense than that which is being talked about dumping. . . ."—*Speech at Rawtenstall.— Rossendale Echo, Nov.* 4, 1903.

"I want to say something upon this subject of dumping. It is a complicated controversy. It had to do with the abominable system of syndicates and cartels and trusts abroad, which are the evils of Protection. . . . I have done my best to inform myself upon this subject. . . . It is evidently a matter which requires very careful consideration. It must be considered with respect to the general interest of the iron trade, which is the greatest trade of this country. And I wish to say here, and to say very sincerely, that I should give the most careful attention to any proposal made by the Government, or made by Mr. Chamberlain, or anyone else, to deal with that question."—*Speech at Ebbw Vale.—Daily News, Dec* 12, 1903.

Mr. H. H. ASQUITH, K.C., M.P.

(Radical Chancellor of the Exchequer.)

"English trade in these days carried on its operations under great, formidable, and increasing difficulties: the wall of tariffs which excluded us from foreign markets was every day becoming higher and higher, and side by side with these hostile and aggressive manifestations we found every day that in activity of industrial energy and industrial equipment our rivals became keener."—*Speech at Associated Chambers of Commerce Banquet, London—Daily News, March* 15, 1894.

"I shall be repeating what many of you will think a truism when I say that, so far from enjoying the anticipated hegemony* that was so confidently predicted for British trade fifty years ago, there is now not the slightest doubt in the mind of anyone that **in the international markets we are fighting for our trade with all our available strength."**—*Speech at Leeds.—Leeds Mercury, Nov.* 24, 1900.

* *i.e.,* preponderating power.

Mr. JOHN MORLEY, M.P.

(Secretary for India.)

". . . If the practical effect of the commercial treaties after 1860, as conceived and inspired by Cobden, has been, without any drawback worth considering, to lead Europe by a considerable stride towards the end proposed by the partizans of free trade, then it is absurd to quarrel with the treaties because they do not sound in tune with the verbal jingle of an abstract dogma. It is beside the mark to meet the advantages gained by the international action of commercial treaties by the formula 'Take care of your imports, and the exports will take care of themselves.' The decisive consideration is that we can only procure imports from other countries on the cheapest possible terms on condition that producers in those countries are able to receive our exports on the cheapest possible terms. Foreign producers can only do this on condition that their Governments can be induced to lower hostile tariffs; and foreign Governments are only able, or choose to believe that they are only able, to lower tariffs in the face of the strength of the protected interests by means of a commercial treaty. The effect of a chain of such treaties—and the chain is automatically linked together by the favoured-nation clause—is to lower duties all round, and lowering duties all round is the essential and indispensable condition of each country procuring for itself on the lowest possible terms imports from all other countries. . ." —*Morley's "Life of Richard Cobden" (Vol II., page* 342, *published in* 1881).

"Great economic and social forces flow with a tidal sweep over communities that are only half-conscious of that which is befalling them. Wise statesmen are those that foresee what time is thus bringing, and endeavour to shape institutions and to mould men's thoughts and purpose in accordance with the change that is silently surrounding them. . ."—*Ibid, page* 484.

Mr. JAMES BRYCE, M.P.

(Secretary for Ireland.)

"Still there did remain a certain section of the population with whose condition they must be dissatisfied, and there remained at all times when trade was depressed a considerable margin of working men who were apt to be in serious difficulties for want of work, and also serious difficulties for want of food and want of comfort. As long as these things lasted, they must not be satisfied with the progress made. . . ."—*Speech at Aberdeen.—Daily Free Press, June* 11, 1897.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE, Bart.

(Radical M.P. for Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean Division.)

"It would seem as if we free traders had become nearly as bigoted in favour of free trade as our former opponents were in favour of protection. Just as they used to say, 'We are right, why argue the

question?' so now, in face of the support of protection by all the greatest minds in America, all the first statesmen of the Australias, we tell the New England and the Australian politicians that we will not discuss protection with them, because there can be no two minds about it among men of intelligence and education. We will hear no defence of 'national lunacy' we say."—*"Greater Britain"* (1868), *Vol. II., page* 61.

Mr. SAMUEL SMITH.

(M.P., Flintshire.)

"I believe a great change has passed over this country on the question of free trade. It is no longer regarded as a panacea for all national evils. It was at one time elevated to a sort of fetish worship by men who did not comprehend its limitations. It was treated as an axiom of economical orthodoxy universally true, and any doubt was treated as heresy was by Torquemada. It is now acknowledged that it is only true with modifications. . . . It is quite impossible that we can permanently compete with America if our hands are tied behind our backs. Mere strumming upon the shibboleths of the days of Cobden and Bright—true at the time they were uttered—will not save us, and a fresh survey of the whole industrial situation is absolutely necessary."—*"My Life Work," by Samuel Smith, M.P., page* 335.

And in a footnote, page 336, "There is much to be said in favour of a moderate duty on manufactured goods imported into this country."

Mr. SAMUEL STOREY.

(Radical M.P. for Sunderland, 1881-95, and until recently President of the Northern Liberal Federation.)

". . . I regard free trade—that is, the free interchange of commodities between communities, without Customs houses on either side—as the ideal system for the human race. No nation has attained to this ideal. We ourselves have not . . . **our present system has entailed two specific evil consequences** not foreseen by Cobden and his compeers; first, the widespread transformation of arable land into pasturage; and, secondly, the circumscription of our markets for manufactured goods by tariffs, and the synchronous free admission of bounty-fed productions from abroad, to the manifest displacement of home products and home labour. These consequences are not accidental and temporary; they are permanent and cumulative, and in my judgment have risen to such proportions as to be fitly described in this year 1903 as national evils . . . For fifty years we have preached free trade as a theory, and practised it with limitations. **We have hoped to convert the world by our example. The world has rejected our counsels.** I reluctantly abandon this hope in favour of another. Is it not permissible to think that if we resume our liberty of action as a nation, if we enable our statesmen to bargain something for something, much for much, little for little, we may attain more nearly to our ideal than we have by our present method?"—*Times, October* 13, 1903.

Published by the Conservative Publication Department, St. Stephen's Chambers Westminster, S.W., in connection with the National Union and the Conservative Central Office. (204.)

Printed by George Berridge & Co., 174, Upper Thames Street, London, E.C.

(N.U.—No. 494.)

EXPORTS

OF

BRITISH MANUFACTURES.

A Comparison with Foreign Exports.

"It is an economic error to confine our view to the imports or exports of our own country."—RIGHT HON. JOHN MORLEY, IN HIS "LIFE OF RICHARD COBDEN," VOL. II., PAGE 343.

The exports of a country are the surest indications of its prosperity or the reverse. No just estimate, however, is to be arrived at by viewing the exports of one country without regard to others. Their condition must be judged by a comparison with those of its foreign rivals.

To point to the increase in British exports and proclaim therefrom a condition of abounding national prosperity is to ignore the real state of affairs. It would indeed be surprising, not to say crushing, if the total exports did *not* increase.

But how does this increase appear when brought into comparison with that of other countries? So far from showing a prosperous tendency, the result reveals an extremely unsatisfactory rate of progress.

The following figures are ample demonstration :—

EXPORT.	1880. Millions of £.	1901. Millions of £.	Increase per cent. 1880-1901.
UNITED STATES— Manufactured goods of U.S.A. production	21·4	85·6	300 per cent.
GERMANY— Manufactured goods of German production	83·5	144·6	73 „
UNITED KINGDOM— Manufactured and partly manufactured goods of British production (exclusive of ships)	198·2	221·0	11 „

—*Extracted from Fiscal Blue-Book, Cd. 1761 of 1903.*

That is, while Germany has increased her exports of manufactured goods by 73 per cent. during the twenty-one years between 1880 and 1901, and the United States hers by 300 per cent., Great Britain's exporting, of both manufactured and partly manufactured articles, shows an insignificant growth of but 11 per cent.

Yet there are people who point proudly to the course of our exporting trade, and say there is no need for a revision of the system of commerce which has brought us to this!

It is useless to evade the fact that Great Britain is dropping behind in the race for commercial supremacy. Our antiquated commercial system should be brought up to date. We cannot afford to remain any longer at a disadvantage—the accommodating, long-suffering refuge for foreign surplus manufactures.

For a country without power to make bargains or offer tit for tat, little consideration is to be expected at the hands of rivals abroad.

The remedy is for the people of this country to give to the Unionist Party the liberty which Mr. Balfour has stated is necessary for our prosperity, namely, "THE LIBERTY TO NEGOTIATE, AND SOMETHING TO NEGOTIATE WITH."

Published by the Conservative Publication Department, St. Stephen's Chambers, Westminster, S.W., in connection with the National Union and the Conservative Central Office. (204)

Printed by VACHER & SONS, Westminster House, Great Smith Street, Westminster.

Negotiation and Retaliation.

THE VIEWS OF THE LATE LORD SALISBURY.

The friends of "free imports" are trying to make the people believe that the late Marquess of Salisbury, who for more than 20 years was the leader of the Conservative and Unionist party, and during that period was four times Prime Minister, would have been opposed to the policy of negotiation and retaliation.

His son, Lord Robert Cecil, effectually disposes of this contention in a letter to the *Times* of January 13, 1904. He writes:—

> **"I do not mean it to be understood that Lord Salisbury was hostile to any imposition of duties on the imports from a foreign country for the purpose of compelling it to admit our exports on fair terms."**

Many of Lord Salisbury's speeches confirm this opinion, as the following quotations show:—

OUR MEAGRE POWERS OF BARGAINING.

In Manchester, on **October 17, 1879,** Lord Salisbury, referring to a memorial presented to him by the Manchester Chamber of Commerce on tariff negotiations with foreign countries, said:— October 17, 1879.

> **Everywhere our business is, if we can, to keep open the avenues of commerce,** and everywhere we see rising around us a thick wall of protection cutting those avenues off. . . . In the address which has been placed before me we are recommended to try and foster the interests of commerce by the conclusion of treaties which shall remove fiscal obstacles which now arrest the flow of commerce. Undoubtedly it is our duty to do so, and undoubtedly we shall make the utmost efforts we can so to do whenever we have the material in our hands; but **we are in the position**—the well-known position—**of being asked to make bricks without straw.** We have to open the doors to the excess of trade when the keys have unfortunately been thrown away by the mistakes of our predecessors. By our predecessors—do not understand that I am talking party politics—I mean our

predecessors of a generation ago. . . . Under the influence of that belief (*i.e.* the universal adoption of free trade) treaties of commerce were looked upon as a species of economical heresy, and vast numbers of duties were thrown away, were repealed, which would have been repealed all the same, but which might have been made conditional on reciprocal repeals in other countries; and, of course, steps of that kind once taken obviously never can be retraced. But the result is that the materials which are in our hands for the conclusion of treaties of commerce are exceedingly meagre. **If you have a** heavily-burdened tariff and a **great number of reductions to make, obviously you have the opportunity of bargaining** for a great number of corresponding reductions elsewhere. If you have very few such articles to deal with, the reductions that you can hope to make are correspondingly few.—*Times*, October, 18, 1879.

OUR ONLY WAY OF DEFENDING OURSELVES.

November 4, 1885. In South London on **November 4, 1885,** Lord Salisbury said:—

. . . You know that free trade is not only young in this country, but it is confined to this country, and that all the great nations of the world besides ourselves are strongly opposed to it, and they make us feel that opposition by erecting a wall of tariffs between us and the markets in their country, which is having a most prejudicial effect upon the industry of our people here. Well, **I do not think it is quite right of them.** It is naturally our wish to use every instrument that we have to induce them to abandon a practice which we as free traders believe to be not only terribly injurious, but also inconsistent with their own welfare properly understood. But we are told we are committing a mortal sin if we try by raising duties on their produce to bring them to a better state of mind. So that we go into this war unarmed. **They strike where they like; we are forbidden** by those principles which have been foisted into the doctrine of free trade **from beating them with their own weapons** and replying to them by their own strategy. I understand free trade to be the negation of protection—that is to say, abstaining from raising an artificial price by excluding the goods of other nations from the markets here. But that has nothing to do with raising the duties in our own tariff for the purpose of influencing the action and legislation of other countries. . . . But we cannot do that. We are forbidden to do it because retaliation is a mortal sin under this doctrine of free trade. **I utterly deny that the true doctrine of free trade has anything to do with it. . . . It is simply an act of retaliation and an act of fiscal war.** No doubt war is a bad thing. We would abolish it if we could, but **war is our only way of defending ourselves from wrong.** Why is it wrong to make it in dealing with our fiscal duties when it is not wrong in other international relations? . . .—*Times*, Nov. 5, 1885.

IS OUR ATTITUDE SUSTAINABLE?

November 10, 1890. In London, on **November 10, 1890,** Lord Salisbury said:—

The conflict which we have to fight is still a conflict of tariffs. **In every country resolutions are being formed and plans are being worked out for limiting still further the intercourse of nations with each other,** and interposing new barriers of tariff between the producers of one country and the consumers of another. And as years go on we shall have to fight that battle. We know that the various nations are looking up their arms, and are seeing with what alterations of tariff they can meet hostile import duties on the other side—on the side of some neighbouring nations—how they can defend themselves, how they can compel a relaxation of the restrictions which they dread. It is the world's conflict of the future. We shall look upon it in a very philosophical spirit, because, whether it affects us for evil or for good, **we are powerless** to interfere. **We have no retaliation to exercise,** because we have already reduced our tariff to the lowest point that the revenue demands will permit us to accept. It is an interesting subject—the consideration for us whether that attitude will or will not be sustainable in the end, or whether the madness of our neighbours will force us to deflect in any degree from the sound and sensible position we adopt. . . .—*Times*, Nov. 11, 1890.

OUR PAST FOLLY.

May 18, 1892. In Hastings on **May 18, 1892,** Lord Salisbury said:—

We live in an age of war of tariffs. Every nation is trying how it can, by agreement with its neighbour, get the greatest possible protection for its own industries, and, at the same time, the greatest possible access to the markets of its neighbours. This kind of negotiation is continually going on. It has been going on for the last year and a-half with great activity. I want to point out to you that what I observe is that while A is very anxious to get a favour of B, and B is anxious to get a favour of C, nobody cares two straws about getting the commercial favour of Great Britain. What is the reason of that? It is that in this great battle **Great Britain has deliberately stripped herself of the armour and the weapons by which the battle has to be fought.** You cannot do business in this world of evil and suffering on those terms. If you go to market you must bring money with you; if you fight you must fight with the weapons with which those you have to contend against are fighting. It is not easy for you to say, "I am a Quaker. I do not fight at all, I have no weapon," and to expect that people will pay the same regard to you, and be as anxious to obtain your goodwill and to consult your interests as they will be of the people who have retained their armour and still hold their weapons. The weapon with which they all fight is admission to their own markets—that is to say, A says to B, "If you will make your duties such that I can sell in your market. I will make my duties such that you can sell in my

market." But we begin by saying, "We will levy no duties on anybody," and we declare that it would be contrary and disloyal to the glorious and sacred doctrine of free trade to levy any duty on anybody for the sake of what we can get by it. **It may be noble, but it is not business.** On those terms you will get nothing. And I am sorry to have to tell you that you are practically getting nothing. The opinion of this country, as stated by its authorised exponents, has been opposed to what is called a retaliatory policy. (A voice: "No, no.") Oh! but it has. We, as the Government of the country at the time, have laid it down for ourselves as a strict rule from which there is no departure, and we are bound not to alter the traditional policy of the country unless we are convinced that a large majority of the country is with us—because in these foreign affairs consistency of policy is beyond all things necessary. But though that is the case, still, if I may aspire to fill the office of a councillor to the public mind, I should ask you to form your own opinions without reference to traditions or denunciations—not to care two straws whether you are orthodox or not, but to form your opinions according to the dictates of common sense. **I would impress upon you that if you intend, in this conflict of commercial treaties, to hold your own, you must be prepared, if need be, to inflict upon the nations which injure you the penalty which is in your hands, that of refusing them access to your markets.** (Loud and prolonged cheers and a voice, **"Common sense at last.")**—*Times*, May 19, 1892.

THE SERIOUS DISADVANTAGE OF OUR POSITION.

March 10, 1897.

At the dinner of the Associated Chambers of Commerce in London, **March 10, 1897,** Lord Salisbury said:—

"We are entering upon a period when the commercial struggle, not of people, but of governments, is becoming more and more active, when they are trying to fight each other with hostile tariffs; and they will try it more and more, and I cannot conceal from myself in the office which I have now held for many years, that it frequently occurs—I do not say in great matters, but in small matters—that **we are injured by the knowledge other nations have that under no circumstances shall we betake ourselves to any kind of retaliation. You might as well send a party to take a fortress without guns, as to enter upon this warfare with such an inability as that.** I am not pretending that retaliation ought to be often practised. Like war, it is a very dangerous weapon, but **the nation which has set up for itself as a fixed principle that it will never retaliate, is at a serious disadvantage in every fiscal controversy that may arise.**—*Times*, March 11, 1897.

Published by the Conservative Publication Department, St. Stephen's Chambers, Westminster, S.W., in connection with the National Union and the Conservative Central Office (304).

Printed by Jas. Truscott & Son, Ltd., London, E.C.

N.U. No. 497.

THE FUTURE OF BRITISH EXPORTS.

FOOD FOR REFLECTION.

The two following Reuter telegrams appear together on Page 3 of *The Times*, of March 4th, 1904:—

The Roumanian Tariff.

BUKAREST, March 3.

The Minister of Finance to-day laid before the Chamber a **Bill imposing new and heavy protective taxes upon imports.** The goods which will have to pay a **high duty** include **Coal,** the object being to foster the development of the native petroleum industry.

Australia & Preferential Tariffs.

MELBOURNE, March 3.

In the Commonwealth House of Representatives to-day, Mr. Deakin, the Federal Premier, stated that **the Government of the Commonwealth was prepared to alter the present tariff in favour of Great Britain,** making sacrifices, if necessary, to secure reciprocal preferences from the mother Country.

Foreigners, even the smaller States of Europe, are determined to preserve and foster Home Industries! Great Britain stands alone in its system of free imports and unfair trade competition.

Issued by the Conservative Publication Department, St. Stephen's Chambers, Westminster, S.W., in connection with the National Union and the Conservative Central Office. (404.)

Printed by McCorquodale & Co., Ltd., "The Armoury," London, S.E.

N.U. No. 498.

ENGLISH AND FOREIGN WORKMEN.

THEIR RELATIVE PROSPERITY.

By Sir HOWARD VINCENT, M.P.

The following communication to *The Times*, of July 6th, 1904, from Sir Howard Vincent, will be read with interest by all working men :—

THE RADICAL CHALLENGE.

Addressing at Woking, on June 27th, the Radical electors of the Chertsey Division, Major J. E. B. Seely, M.P., said :—

"He challenged the tariff reformers to send a commission of working men to Continental protected countries to see which was the better, Protection or Free Trade, and he would abide by the issue."

THE REPLY.

Surely he is aware that, owing to the unparalleled generosity and public spirit of Mr. Mosely, C.M.G., an industrial commission, consisting of the secretaries of twenty-three trade unions, went to the American Continent in October and December, 1902, expressly to ascertain why "as a manufacturing country America is forging ahead at a pace hardly realised by either British employer or workman." I am sending the volume of the Mosely Reports, published by Cassell & Co., at 6*d*., to Major Seely, as it is impossible for him to speak on trade and tariff questions without knowledge of it. But as he is busy in opposing the Government upon many subjects, including the regulation of that alien

im migration which presses so hardly upon the workers of many districts, I may quote two or three of the facts made clear by the reports.

In his preface Mr. Mosely says they show :—

(1) "That the American workman earns higher wages is beyond question."

(2) "That food is as cheap (if not cheaper) in the United States as in England, whilst general necessaries may be put on the same level."

Lest Major Seely discredits Mr. Mosely, with all his wide experience, let me take one of the trade union secretaries in whom he has confidence. I have difficulty in selection. Were I to quote Mr. R. Holmshaw, of the Sheffield Cutlery Council, in his dictum, "Wages are generally about 100 per cent. higher in America than in Sheffield," he might think it applied only to the iron and steel trade. But, perhaps Mr. W. C. Steadman, of the Trades Union Parliamentary Committee, is as likely as anyone else to convince him. Here are the questions and Mr. Steadman's answers :—

Are the American workers better fed than the English?—Generally speaking, yes.

How does the price of food in America compare with that in England?—About the same.

How does the average wage in your trade in America, expressed in money, compare with the average wage in England?—Fifty per cent. better off.

Can the careful, steady man, whilst keeping himself efficient, save more in America than in England?—Yes.

Are a larger or smaller proportion of American working men dependent upon the public purse than is the case in England?—Smaller.

The other delegates without exception write to like effect.

Here is a synopsis of their opinions :—

Delegate.			Wages in America compared to Great Britain.	Workman's position in America compared to Great Britain.
1.	Secretary,	Blast Furnacemen's Society (Mr. P. Walls)	40 per cent. higher.	25 per cent. better
2.	"	Boiler Makers' Society (Mr. D. C. Cummings)	75 per cent. to 100 per cent. higher.	"He can save more."
3.	"	Bookbinders' Society (Mr. W. Coffey)	70 per cent. to 100 per cent. higher and more.	25 per cent. better.
4.	"	Boot and Shoe Trade (Mr. W. B. Hornidge)	30 per cent. to 70 per cent. higher.	"Can save 8s. 4d. against 2s. here."
5.	"	Bricklayers' Society (Mr. H. R. Taylor)	200 per cent. to 250 per cent. higher.	"Quite 50 per cent. better off, allowing for idle time in inclement weather."
6.	"	Carpenters' Society (Mr. H. Crawford)	"Very much better."	Very much better, expenses being about equal, except rent and clothes.
7.	"	Chains, Nails, &c., Society (Mr. T. Jones)	"Higher."	"The American has the advantage."
8.	"	Compositors' Society (Mr. C. W. Bowerman)	"About 4s. a day more."	"Better."
9.	"	Cotton Spinners' Society (Mr. T. Ashton)	75 per cent. higher.	40 per cent. better.
10.	"	Engineers' Society (Mr. G. N. Barnes)	35 per cent. to 70 per cent. higher.	15 per cent. and upwards better.
11.	"	Furnishing Trades' Society (Mr. H. Ham)	60 per cent. to 100 per cent. higher.	"Compares most favourably."
12.	"	Iron and Steel Workers' Society (Mr. J. Cox)	100 per cent. to 200 per cent. higher.	"Great deal better."
13.	"	Ironfounders' Society (Mr. J. Maddison)	Over 100 per cent. higher.	"Great deal better."
14.	"	Leather Workers' Society (Mr. G. J. Lapping)	50 per cent. higher.	"A small percentage better."
15.	"	Lithographic Printers' Society (Mr. G. D. Kelley)	"Double at least."	"Quite 60 per cent. better."
16.	"	Papermakers' Society (Mr. W. Dyson)	"50 per cent. better at least."	"About 25 per cent. more."
17.	"	Plasterers' Association (Mr. M. Dellar)	"Over double."	"At least 25 per cent. more."
18.	"	Shipwrights' Society (Mr. A. Wilkie)	"Somewhat higher."	"He can save more."
19.	"	Tailors' Society (Mr. T. H. Flynn)	100 per cent. higher.	50 per cent. better.
20.	"	Weavers' Associations (Mr. W. H. Wilkinson)	75 per cent. higher.	10 per cent. to 15 per cent. better off.

But Major Seely may say he meant the European, and not the American, Continent. *The comparison, however, between our own condition and that of our kinsmen with like tastes, habits, predilections, customs and ambitions, is far more accurate than with Frenchman, German, Italian, or Spaniard.* Yet if any man with the public spirit of Mr. Mosely comes forward, we who have long contended with knowledge of the facts gained on the spot and with no personal end to serve that free imports without reciprocity, if good for the rich like Major Seely, are bad for the worker, have no need to fear the result. **Frenchmen, all possessing a vote, all taking interest in the government of the country by themselves, all eager to make and to save money, may be trusted to know what is best for the working classes. Their economies are so great that they are the creditors of the world.** They have lent £300,000,000 to Russia, and every direction gives evidence of their wealth and enterprise. Let Major Seely go to the Bourse du Travail in Paris or any great city and he will find no one-sided free-trader. Nor will he be more successful amid the prosperous millions of Westphalia, nor in the marvellous growth of Berlin and other cities of the Fatherland since the day when William the Great and Prince Bismarck declared their policy to be—**One flag, one crown, one trade.** We are far more fortunately situated, for the British Empire produces in limitless quantity all we do or can possibly want for any purpose whatever. Cannot Major Seely realise this?

NOTE.—Since the above letter was written, a deputation numbering nearly 400 from the Union of Working Men's Clubs and Institutes and the Association of Conservative Clubs has visited Paris, and been received with unparalleled warmth and hospitality by the President of the Republic and the French people. There is no visitor not profoundly impressed with the marvellous prosperity of France, the distribution of her wealth among all classes, the extent of industrial savings, the comfort and luxury of living of her working class population, and their acute intelligence and sobriety.

In the return visit the French Working men were taken to the Marylebone Workhouse. They admired its arrangements, but said, "We have no such institution, and no need for it."

Working Men! Read these facts and compare them with some of the misrepresentations that are being circulated!!

Published by the Conservative Publication Department, St. Stephen's Chambers, Westminster, S.W., in connection with the National Union and the Conservative Central Office.

McCorquodale & Co. Limited, Printers, "The Armoury," London, S.E.

(C.C.O.—No. 459.)

SUGAR.

READ BOTH SIDES.

BEET SUGAR.

SUPPLY IN TONS—

1903-4	- -	**5,882,000**
1904-5	- -	**4,950,000**
DECREASE	-	**932,000**

Cause of Decrease—DROUGHT.

If the Unionists had not got foreign countries to do away with the Bounties, there would not have been the large increase in Cane Sugar; the supply would have been less and the

PRICE HIGHER.

SUGAR.

READ BOTH SIDES.

CANE SUGAR.

SUPPLY IN TONS—

1903-4	-	**6,613,000**
1904-5	- -	**6,890,000**
INCREASE	-	**277,000**

Cause of Increase—Sugar Bounties done away with, the principal cause.

We have had 18,000 more tons of Cane Sugar from the West Indies alone.

The supply of Cane Sugar is greater, for the growers have got fair play.

Instead of being dependent on one source of supply, as was rapidly becoming the case owing to Foreign Bounties. England, in future, will have two sources of supply.

Issued by the Conservative Publication Department, St. Stephen's Chambers, Westminster, S.W., in connection with the Conservative Central Office and the National Union.

McCorquodale & Co. Limited, Printers, "The Armoury," London, S.E.

THE PRICE OF SUGAR.

THE RADICAL AGITATION EXPOSED.

In March, 1902, the Brussels Sugar Convention was signed. In September, 1903, the Convention came into force. Owing to drought on the Continent the price of sugar rose in the years 1903 and 1904.

The Radicals at once fastened upon the rise in price, attributed it to the Sugar Convention, and started an agitation against the Government on the ground that the Convention was the cause of the increased price.

The hollowness of their agitation is now exposed, for, although the Sugar Convention is still in force,

SUGAR IS NOW CHEAPER THAN IT WAS BEFORE THE CONVENTION.

Price of Raw Sugar (88% Beet f.o.b.)

		s.	d.	
1903	Jan. 1 ...	**8**	**0**	
„	Sep. 1 ...	**8**	**6**	Convention came into force, Sep. 1.
1904	Jan. 1 ...	**8**	**3**	Prices rising owing to shortage in the crop in consequence of drought.
1905	Jan. 1 ...	**14**	**10½**	
„	Jan. 19 ...	**16**	**1½**	
„	Dec. 7 ...	**8**	**4½**	Price fallen owing to better crops, &c.

The price of sugar has fallen by 7s. 9d. between January 19 and December 7, 1905, and is now 1½d. per cwt. cheaper than it was before the convention came into operation.

IT IS PLAIN, THEREFORE, THAT THE SUGAR CONVENTION WAS NOT THE CAUSE OF THE HIGH PRICES OF SUGAR, AND THAT

THE AGITATION WAS A FALSE ONE.

Published by the Conservative Publication Department, St. Stephen's Chambers, Westminster, S.W., in connection with the National Union and the Conservative Central Office.

Printed by Waterlow & Sons Limited, London Wall, London; and 49, Parliament Street, Westminster, S.W.

N.U.—No. 500.

FISCAL REFORM.

Mr. Balfour's Policy on a half-sheet of note paper.

For the enlightenment of Radical obtuseness, both wilful and natural, the Right Hon. A. J. Balfour, M.P., made in Manchester, on January 26, 1905, the following concise statement of his fiscal policy. He said :—

I.—I desire such an alteration of our fiscal system as will give us a freedom of action impossible while we hold ourselves bound by the maxim that no taxation should be imposed except for revenue. I desire this freedom in the main for three reasons: (*a*) It will strengthen our hands in any negotiations by which we may hope to lower foreign hostile tariffs: (*b*) it may enable us to protect the fiscal independence of those Colonies which desire to give us preferential treatment; (*c*) it may be useful where we wish to check the importation of those foreign goods which, because they are bounty fed or tariff protected **abroad,** are sold below cost price **here.** Such importations are ultimately as injurious to the British consumer as they are immediately disastrous to the British producer.

II.—I desire closer commercial union with the Colonies; and I do so because I desire closer union in all its possible modes, and because this particular mode is intrinsically of great importance and has received much Colonial support. I also think it might produce great and growing commercial advantages, both to the Colonies and the Mother Country, by promoting freer trade between them

III.—No doubt such commercial union is beset with many difficulties. These can best be dealt with by a Colonial Conference, provided its members are permitted to discuss them unhampered by limiting instructions. I recommend, therefore, that the subject should be referred to a Conference on those terms.

IV.—I do **not** desire to raise home prices for the purpose of aiding home productions.

Published by the Conservative Publication Department, St. Stephen's Chambers, Westminster, S.W., in connection with the National Union and the Conservative Central Office.

McCorquodale & Co. Limited, Printers, "The Armoury," London, S.E.

(C.C.O.—No. 502.)

LET US GIVE YOU A WARNING.

Radicals tell you that Mr. BALFOUR wants

TO TAX YOUR FOOD.

They say that if you vote for the Conservatives and Unionists you will go back to the old days of the "Hungry Forties," when corn was 70s. a quarter and the 4-lb. loaf cost 1s.

But that is not the case. The Radicals are trying a little game on you.

This is what Mr. Balfour is now asking you:—

(i.) To give him the power to try and get foreign countries to make their duties against the goods we want to sell less high.

(ii.) To let him call together a Conference with our great Colonies and India, to see if we cannot find a way to trade together on lines which will mean that we shall sell them more of our goods and get their goods on better terms.

If this Conference does find a way of doing this, then it will be for you to say if you want it carried out.

That is what Mr. Balfour is asking you.

Do you see in it anything about taxing your food, or about making the loaf cost——

No! Nothing of the kind.

The Radicals are trying to frighten you with bogeys.

Trust the Unionists, your friends in the past; your friends now; your friends in the future, and assist to bring about real Free Trade, and render this Empire a reality.

Vote for the Unionist Candidate.

Published by the Conservative Publication Department, St. Stephen's Chambers, Westminster, S.W., in connection with the Conservative Central Office and the National Union. (J.5.)
Printed by Waterlow & Sons Limited, London Wall, London; and 49, Parliament Street, Westminster, S.W.

THE COLONIAL CONFERENCE RESOLUTION.

The following is the text of the Resolution passed at the 1902 Conference of Colonial Prime Ministers with the Rt. Hon. J. Chamberlain, M.P., then Secretary of State for the Colonies:—

Resolution:—"1. That this Conference recognises that the principle of preferential trade between the United Kingdom and his Majesty's dominions beyond the seas would stimulate and facilitate mutual commercial intercourse, and would, by promoting the development of the resources and industries of the several parts, strengthen the Empire.

"2. That this Conference recognises that, in the present circumstances of the Colonies, it is not practicable to adopt a general system of Free Trade as between the Mother Country and the British dominions beyond the seas.

"3. That with a view, however, to promoting the increase of trade within the Empire, it is desirable that those Colonies which have not already adopted such a policy should, as far as their circumstances permit, give substantial preferential treatment to the products and manufacturers of the United Kingdom.

"4. **That the Prime Ministers of the Colonies respectfully urge on his Majesty's Government the expediency of granting, in the United Kingdom, preferential treatment**

[P.T.O.

INTENTIONAL SECOND EXPOSURE

(ii.) To let him call together a Conference with our great Colonies and India, to see if we cannot find a way to trade together on lines which will mean that we shall sell them more of our goods and get their goods on better terms.

If this Conference does find a way of doing this, then it will be for you to say if you want it carried out.

That is what Mr. Balfour is asking you.

Do you see in it anything about taxing your food, or about making the loaf cost——

No! Nothing of the kind.

The Radicals are trying to frighten you with bogeys.

Trust the Unionists, your friends in the past; your friends now; your friends in the future, and assist to bring about real Free Trade, and render this Empire a reality.

Vote for the Unionist Candidate.

Published by the Conservative Publication Department, St. Stephen's Chambers, Westminster, S.W., in connection with the Conservative Central Office and the National Union. (J.5.)
Printed by Waterlow & Sons Limited, London Wall, London; and 49, Parliament Street, Westminster, S.W.

N.U. No. 487.

THE COLONIAL CONFERENCE RESOLUTION.

The following is the text of the Resolution passed at the 1902 Conference of Colonial Prime Ministers with the Rt. Hon. J. Chamberlain, M.P., then Secretary of State for the Colonies:—

Resolution:—"1. That this Conference recognises that the principle of preferential trade between the United Kingdom and his Majesty's dominions beyond the seas would stimulate and facilitate mutual commercial intercourse, and would, by promoting the development of the resources and industries of the several parts, strengthen the Empire.

"2. That this Conference recognises that, in the present circumstances of the Colonies, it is not practicable to adopt a general system of Free Trade as between the Mother Country and the British dominions beyond the seas.

"3. That with a view, however, to promoting the increase of trade within the Empire, it is desirable that those Colonies which have not already adopted such a policy should, as far as their circumstances permit, give substantial preferential treatment to the products and manufacturers of the United Kingdom.

"4. **That the Prime Ministers of the Colonies respectfully urge on his Majesty's Government the expediency of granting, in the United Kingdom, preferential treatment**

[P.T.O.

to the products and manufactures of the Colonies, either by exemption from or reduction of duties now or hereafter imposed.

"5. That the Prime Ministers present at the Conference undertake to submit to their respective Governments, at the earliest opportunity, the principle of the resolution, and to request them to take such measures as may be necessary to give effect to it."

COLONIAL PROPOSALS.

The representatives of the Colonies are prepared to recommend to their respective Parliaments preferential treatment of British goods on the following lines:—

Canada:—The existing preference of 33 1-3 per cent., and an additional preference on lists of selected articles—(*a*) by further reducing the duties in favour of the United Kingdom; (*b*) by raising the duties against foreign imports; (*c*) by imposing duties on certain foreign imports now on the free list.

Australia:—Preferential treatment not yet defined as to nature or extent.

New Zealand:—A general preference by 10 per cent. all-round reduction of the present duty on British manufactured goods, or an equivalent in respect of lists of selected articles on the lines proposed by Canada, namely:— (*a*) by further reducing the duties in favour of the United Kingdom; (*b*) by raising the duties against foreign imports; (*c*) by imposing duties on certain foreign imports now on the free list.

The Cape and Natal:—A preference of 25 per cent. or its equivalent on dutiable goods other than specially-rated articles to be given by increasing the duties on foreign imports. (*See Blue Book, Cd.* 1299 *of* 1902, *pages IX.-X.*)

Canada, New Zealand, the Cape and Natal have since granted us these Preferences.

Published by the Conservative Publication Department, St. Stephen's Chambers, Westminster, S.W., in connection with the National Union and the Conservative Central Office.
McCorquodale & Co. Limited, Printers, "The Armoury," London, S.E.

N.U. No. 501.

FREE TRADE AS ACCEPTED BY THE RADICAL PARTY.

THE FREE TRADE CATECHISM OF THE RADICALS.

The Radical attitude on the question of Fiscal Reform shows that they fail entirely to grasp the seriousness of the question. They display a supreme disregard for the interests of their own country, and content themselves with meeting facts with sneers, and problems with evasions.

Their position has been fitly summarised by the Rt. Hon. Sir Edward Carson, K.C., M.P., in the following catechism, set forth by him in a speech at Brighton, on April 1, 1905:—

> "... I try every morning to say the Free Trade catechism as propounded by the Liberal party, and I must say of their Free Trade catechism that the more I read it, the more sceptical I am about it. Now, just let me read it to you as I understand it:—

Q. **"What is Free Trade?"**

A. **"The interchange of produots and manufactures of nations on conditions that British goods only should be taxed."**

That is the true Liberal answer.

Then the next question is this:—

Q. **"What is Protection?"**

A. **"The attempting to procure from foreign countries the same treatment for our produots and manufactures as we accord to others."**

And that is what the Liberals call Protection!

[TURN OVER.

Now then, here is the next question, and I commend it to you :—

Q. **"Has Free Trade as it at present exists proved an unqualified success?"**

A. **(Cries of "No.") That is not the answer—the answer is:—"Yes, because Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman has told us that under this system only 13 millions of our population are always on the verge of starvation."**

This is the next question :—

Q. **"Can nothing be done to prevent one-third of our population being always in that sad condition?"**

A. **"No, because the picture of a big loaf is more enticing than the picture of a little one for electioneering purposes."**

And then comes the next and a very important question :—

Q. **"What answer are we to give our Colonies when they ask us to enter into commercial relations for our mutual benefit?"**

A. **The answer is:—"You must tell them that it is beneath the dignity of this country to enter into any such squalid bonds."**—*The Sussex Daily News, April 3, 1905.*

To the Radical mind it is evident that Pauperism, Unemployment, diminished Prosperity, and a growing rot at the root of Britain's commercial position, are vague figures of speech, and subjects for academic debate only.

To the Unionist Party they are vivid realities, whose cry for remedy must not go unanswered.

It is the aim of the Unionist Party to place British commerce in a position to compete on fair terms with the commerce of foreign countries. It is their aim to improve the position of the 13 millions of British subjects said by Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman to be on the verge of starvation, and to find employment for the unemployed.

VOTE FOR THE UNIONIST CANDIDATE.

Published by the Conservative Publication Department, St. Stephen's Chambers, Westminster, S.W., in connection with the National Union and the Conservative Central Office (505).

Printed by JAS. TRUSCOTT & SON, LTD., London, E.C.

RADICALS AND RETALIATION

Convicted out of their own mouths.

Radicals say Retaliation is no good. They think we can only "fight high tariffs by free imports."

They jeer at suggestions of treating the foreigner as the foreigner treats us. **The policy the Radicals preach** is the policy of **"don't do anything."**

Sugar Bounties worked injury to British industries. Radicals knew it, but they failed to end a system which produced huge fluctuations in the price of sugar and which practically killed the sugar refining industry in this country, depriving British working men of employment, besides bringing ruin on our West Indian Colonies, and threatening the prosperity of thousands in our East Indian Empire and in Mauritius.

The Unionist Government succeeded in ending an iniquitous system that was unfair to British industry.

How did they do it?

Radicals say the Unionist Government did it by a threat of Retaliation.

Here is an extract from "Ten Years of Tory Government": A Handbook for the use of Liberals, published in October, 1905, by the Liberal Publication Department (in connection with the National Liberal Federation and Liberal Central Association):—

*"The official papers prove that no agreement would have been reached if we had not—solely in the interest of the West Indies—**Coerced the Continental Powers.** As late as February 24, 1902, the British delegates reported that France and Austria-Hungary could not agree. On February 25, Lord Lansdowne telegraphed:—*

'Should no agreement be come to by the Powers within the course of a few days, His Majesty's Government will be reluctantly forced to withdraw their delegates and submit to Parliament proposals for the taxation of sugar in 1902-3, framed on the assumption that the object of the conference has not been obtained.'

"It was this threat of a hostile British tariff that compelled the unwilling Powers to do some-

[P.T.O.

thing in the direction of abandoning a system which was injurious to them and profitable *to us. Thus the intervention of the British Government was in no sense a friendly act of international courtesy intended to help friendly nations out of a difficulty in which their own folly had involved them, but* ***an act of commercial warfare undertaken in the sole interest of the West Indies."*** *(pp. 28 and 29.)*

Of course, because Unionists succeeded where they failed, Radicals sneer at the result. But as they tried again and again to abolish Sugar Bounties, which were condemned by Mr. Gladstone and other leading members of their party, they may be forgiven for crying "Sour Grapes." What specially deserves notice is the **Radical tribute to the powers of Retaliation.** Radicals pretend it would be of no use to this country, but they are here convicted out of their own mouths. They declare it was **"the threat of a hostile British tariff"** which enabled the Unionist Government to succeed where Radicals had feebly failed.

But it is just that power of Retaliation which the Government is asking from the people of this country. If you should have any doubt about the value of that power against unfair treatment of British trade, read the Radical statement above.

Remember what the late Lord Salisbury said on the very same subject of Sugar Bounties and Retaliation, in reply to a deputation from Trade Unions in the chief industrial centres, introduced to him by Mr. Thomas Burt, M.P., (Radical), to protest against the Sugar Bounties as injurious to the working classes of this country:—

"Now, what I want you to consider is this, that you are dealing with an adversary who is doing you wrong. **If a man hits you, you have two ways of dealing with him.** You may expostulate with him, and point out to him the extreme impudence and wickedness to himself of hitting you as he is doing; or, if you think that that mode of action is not likely to lead to a satisfactory and to a sufficient result, **you may act to him as he is acting to you."**—*Times*, July 23, 1887.

Radicals complain that we "coerced" foreign nations by telling them we should not submit to the injury they were inflicting on our trade, but should **hit them back. But that is how we got what we wanted—**

Fair and just treatment for British Trade.

Published by the Conservative Publication Department, St. Stephen's Chambers, Westminster, S.W., in connection with the National Union and the Conservative Central Office. **(1205)**
McCorquodale & Co. Limited, Printers, "The Armoury," London, S.E.

INTENTIONAL SECOND EXPOSURE

thing in the direction of abandoning a system which was injurious to them and profitable *to us. Thus the intervention of the British Government was in no sense a friendly act of international courtesy intended to help friendly nations out of a difficulty in which their own folly had involved them, but* ***an act of commercial warfare undertaken in the sole interest of the West Indies."*** *(pp. 28 and 29.)*

Of course, because Unionists succeeded where they failed, Radicals sneer at the result. But as they tried again and again to abolish Sugar Bounties, which were condemned by Mr. Gladstone and other leading members of their party, they may be forgiven for crying "Sour Grapes." What specially deserves notice is the **Radical tribute to the powers of Retaliation.** Radicals pretend it would be of no use to this country, but they are here convicted out of their own mouths. They declare it was **"the threat of a hostile British tariff"** which enabled the Unionist Government to succeed where Radicals had feebly failed.

But it is just that power of Retaliation which the Government is asking from the people of this country. If you should have any doubt about the value of that power against unfair treatment of British trade, read the Radical statement above.

Remember what the late Lord Salisbury said on the very same subject of Sugar Bounties and Retaliation, in reply to a deputation from Trade Unions in the chief industrial centres, introduced to him by Mr. Thomas Burt, M.P., (Radical), to protest against the Sugar Bounties as injurious to the working classes of this country:—

"Now, what I want you to consider is this, that you are dealing with an adversary who is doing you wrong. **If a man hits you, you have two ways of dealing with him.** You may expostulate with him, and point out to him the extreme impudence and wickedness to himself of hitting you as he is doing; or, if you think that that mode of action is not likely to lead to a satisfactory and to a sufficient result, **you may act to him as he is acting to you."**—*Times*, July 23, 1887.

Radicals complain that we "coerced" foreign nations by telling them we should not submit to the injury they were inflicting on our trade, but should **hit them back. But that is how we got what we wanted—**

Fair and just treatment for British Trade.

Published by the Conservative Publication Department, St. Stephen's Chambers, Westminster, S.W., in connection with the National Union and the Conservative Central Office. (1205)
McCorquodale & Co. Limited, Printers, "The Armoury," London, S.E.

Birmingham Gazette.

We can heartily recommend it, for it **contains a vast** array of facts and figures **of the utmost use** to anyone who would understand the politics of the present day.

Midland Evening News.

We should say that all Unionists who desire to be able to give a reason for the faith that is in them, will make a point of at once adding the book to their libraries.

Belfast News Letter.

The amount of facts, quotations, and general political information gathered into this book is amazing.

Perthshire Constitutional and Journal.

The purpose of the "National Union Gleanings" is to assist politicians and journalists in getting at the information of which they are in search, and that with the least possible trouble. And most admirably is this purpose carried.

St. James's Gazette.

Altogether the "National Union Gleanings" is **a treasury of useful political information.** No M.P., journalist, local association, or any other person or corporation political, can be without them; and the ordinary elector will be the better for them.

Bristol Times and Mirror.

Choke-full of facts which cannot be controverted, and are admirably compiled.

Durham County Advertiser.

A perfect little library in itself, and ought to find a place on the bookshelves of every household.

Coventry Standard.

Should be invaluable to political writers and speakers

National Union Gleanings.

Issued about the 15th of every Month.

A Monthly Magazine of Accurate and Authoritative Information concerning—

ALL THE CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES IN THE POLITICS OF THE DAY.

VERBATIM EXTRACTS from Latest Utterances of Political Leaders, from Parliamentary and Official Publications, from Newspapers and Magazines of the Month,

AUTHENTICATED BY Accurate References to Dates, Places and Sources,

CLASSIFIED IN SUBJECTS,

ACCOMPANIED BY A DIARY for the Month of Events (Domestic, Foreign and Colonial),

ALSO BY A COPIOUS INDEX.

THE MONTHLY INDEXES ARE CONSOLIDATED every half-year, and presented to Subscribers.

THIS COMPREHENSIVE MAGAZINE supplies the place of and makes unnecessary to Politicians the laborious keeping up of newspaper cuttings books. The Magazine preserves and records the items; the Index makes easy the search for them. When back numbers and Indexes are kept and bound, it becomes a simple process to trace back a connected history of every matter that is or recently has been in controversy between political parties.

PREPARED for the Publication Committee of the National Union, at their Reference Library at St. Stephen's Chambers, by the Editor and Assistant Secretary of the National Union, Mr. W. J. MARSHALL, Librarian of the National Union.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTIONS for "Gleanings," delivered free by post in the United Kingdom, either at Subscribers' own addresses or at other addresses indicated by them (*e.g.*, Political Clubs, Secretaries' or Agents' Offices, &c.):—

One Copy at One Address	7s. 6d.
One Copy at each of Three Addresses ...	21s. 0d.
One Copy at each of Six Addresses ...	40s. 0d.

APPLY TO the Secretary, Mr. A. E. SOUTHALL, National Union, St. Stephen's Chambers, Westminster

Telegraphic Address: "CONSTITUTE, LONDON."

For Press Notices, see inside this Cover.

N.U. No. 561.

THE FISCAL QUESTION.

LEADING RADICAL STATEMENTS REGARDING GREAT BRITAIN'S SOCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL CONDITION.

WANTED!

THE RADICAL REMEDY.

INTENTIONAL SECOND EXPOSURE

National Union Gleanings.

Issued about the 15th of every Month.

A Monthly Magazine of Accurate and Authoritative Information concerning

ALL THE CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES IN THE POLITICS OF THE DAY.

VERBATIM EXTRACTS from [illegible]

AUTHENTICATED BY [illegible]

CLASSIFIED IN SUBJECTS.

ACCOMPANIED BY A DIARY [illegible]

ALSO BY A COPIOUS INDEX.

THE MONTHLY INDEXES ARE CONSOLIDATED [illegible]

THIS COMPREHENSIVE MAGAZINE [illegible]

PREPARED [illegible]

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTIONS [illegible]

One Copy at One Address
One Copy at each of Three Addresses
One Copy at each of Six Addresses

APPLY TO [illegible]

For Press Notices, see Inside this Cover.

N.U. No. 561.

THE FISCAL QUESTION.

LEADING RADICAL STATEMENTS REGARDING GREAT BRITAIN'S SOCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL CONDITION.

WANTED!

THE RADICAL REMEDY.

THE FISCAL QUESTION.

LEADING RADICAL STATEMENTS REGARDING GREAT BRITAIN'S SOCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL CONDITION.

I.

"Now, Mr. Chairman, **as we are, before all things, an industrial and commercial community, a failure or decline in our trade is a vital fact.**"—(SIR HENRY CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, at Bolton, October 15th, 1903; *Bolton Evening News* (R.), October 16th, 1903.)

An attempt is here made to collate some of the statements made by the Leaders and other prominent members of the Radical party regarding the social condition and trade of the country. Both the social and commercial state of this country, as represented by them, in their less optimistic moments, would appear to be in more urgent need of redress than any member of the late Conservative and Unionist Government, or, in fact, any prominent member of that party, has yet suggested.

Notwithstanding, the Radical party at the present time are endeavouring to secure their return to power, at the coming election, on a purely **negative** policy, unaccompanied by pledges of any description.

For example, according to the Radical Home Secretary:—

"If the Liberal party won at the next Election, as he was confident they would, the great principles of Free Trade would be vindicated, and **their duty, in the main, would have been done in victoriously asserting that those principles were necessary to the trade and prosperity of the country.**"—(MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE, Leeds, October 15th, 1903; *Leeds Mercury*, October 16th, 1903.)

Speaking at Crewe, on September 25th, 1905, the EARL OF CREWE (Lord President of the Council) said:—

"They were all assuming, and were entitled to assume, because their opponents assumed it no less than they did, that a very considerable Liberal majority would be restored to power at the next General Election. Many people were very anxious to know what that Government, when formed, was going to do. **There was one thing**

he thought which the leaders of the party—those who took the most prominent part in its affairs in both Houses of Parliament—**were not going to do, and that was to make any definite statement of a programme,** or the order of procedure, in which various measures were to be brought forward, even though invited to do so by some of their excellent and enthusiastic supporters."—(*Crewe Chronicle* (R.), September 30th, 1905.)

Such a course of action, the Executive of the National Democratic League has, not without reason, condemned in a resolution as:—

"Dangerous to public liberty, being nothing less than a demand that the nation shall blindly commit itself to unpledged leaders with an unknown programme of democratic reform, or there would be no anxiety to conceal it until it will be too late for the people to remedy or prevent it."—(*Morning Post*, September 30th, 1905.)

The extreme dissatisfaction which this attempt on the part of the Radical party proper, to secure their return on a purely **negative** policy, is exciting amongst the majority of the Labour party, is shown by the following:—

On Sept. 15th, 1905, THE CLARION, *in its leading article says*:—

The *Daily Chronicle* refers to the Elgin election as "another victory for Free Trade," and to the Conservative defeats as "the long list of Protectionist disasters." The issue between Liberals and Tories, then, is Free Trade *versus* Protection, and **when the former party have won** at the next General Election, **we shall be told that they have received a "mandate"** from the country **to carry out those glorious principles which Cobden and Bright,** &c., &c., &c. Of Social Reform— of Free Maintenance of Children, of the claim to Opportunity of Work and Life, of Housing Reform, of Old Age Pensions, of Railway and Land Nationalization—not a word. The great Progressive **Liberal party will come into power to hold up the glorious existing order of things, to *maintain* free trade** which has been in full swing for the last fifty years! And in the same issue of the *Chronicle* Dr. Guinness Rogers pleads for "cordial co-operation between Liberals and Labour," declaring that the aims of the two parties are identical! They are to stand together to secure free trade and confound protection! Labour is to halt and mark time, Labour is to rest content with the fearful death-rates in the slums, the starving children in the schools, the old parents in the workhouse, the crime and shame and misery and disease of the city slews, in order to make sure of cheap food implying cheap labour for Manchester manufacturers.

"FREE TRADE" TO THE WINDS.

If Mr. Smoothbore, Liberal candidate, declares himself in favour of free trade, Labour is to vote for him, regardless of other considerations. We are expected to be satisfied with that assurance,

to demand no more, to expect no more, but to go at once and vote—according to the colour of the ribbon pinned on to us. It is the party system. We might ask, "What is he going to do?" or "What kind of man is he?" or "Is it true that he pays his hands under the trade price?" "Is his paper printed in a 'rat' shop?" or so on; but no! It matters nothing, he is in favour of free trade. We want to know whether he is in favour of the demolition of slums. Or if he is in favour of the feeding of the children. Or if he thinks eighteen hours too long a time for a man to be in a railway signal-box. Or whether he regards jerry-building as a "form of competition." But you see these questions are not to be asked. He is in favour of free trade. As if free trade mattered to the workers! The measure of Labour's share of its own produce depends neither on protection nor free trade, but simply on its own resolve to demand, and organized power to exact, a steadily increasing proportion of the fruit of its labour.

AND HAIL! PROTECTION.

Under a careful system of protection, though the price of commodities would rise, wages would rise too; and as consumers who are *not* producers would help to pay the increased cost of food, and as the unemployed would probably be reduced by absorption in new or revived industries, the effect, on the whole, to the workers would probably be in the direction of temporary improvement. . . .

PLAIN SPEECH INDEED.

Dr. Guinness Rogers needs to be told that the workers have not entered the political arena to help Manchester manufacturers to secure cheap labour, but merely to take over the Government of Great Britain—the government of the wealth created by their industry, the government of their own and their children's lives. **There is no room in these matters for sentimental twaddle about the Liberal party's vague aspirations.** It is a case of grim warfare. The workers are becoming daily more resolute and more united. Once their organization is completed they are masters of the field. When they are the masters they will insist upon their demands being granted. This may seem very cruel and very selfish to the old women and callow college chicks who write the rubbish for the Liberal papers; but it is the solid food of fact to men. The case is clear, workers' standard of life must go up. The master's profits and the landlord's rents and royalties must go down. That is *our* political programme.

THE STING IN THE TAIL.

Will Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman and his gang of Liberal plutocrats cordially co-operate with Labour in that campaign?

The *Labour Leader*, on October 20th, 1905, in a leading article, says:—

". . . Liberalism to-day is in the main content to provide candidates adapted to the state of political ignorance and social abasement in which Liberalism has allowed the people to remain. And in towering confirmation of this indictment comes **the latest Liberal Manifesto. It is a document of Dead Sea fruit.** It contains barely a

trace of living faith in the future. **It bears not a word of hope for the poor, the unemployed** . . . the sternest approver of social inequality and wrong might stand pledged to every word of this battle-cry of Liberalism."

In Hanley on Sept. 4, 1905, MR. JAMES SEXTON, President of the Trades Union Congress, in his presidential address, said :—

". . . Even **so-called Free Trade to-day has failed to settle, or even to touch our greatest social evil, the unemployed problem.** In fact we have no Free Trade in the truest sense of the word, and never can have without we secure the freedom of produce, not for the benefit of the few, but for the benefit of all mankind and the injury of none of God's creatures. This cannot be said of the present-day Free Trade. It is, therefore, not enough for the Free Trader to declaim against the policy of Protection or the preferential policy of Mr. Balfour. The Labour Party should demand much more than **a policy of negation** or anti-Government, and that—so far, at least—**is all we are offered by those anxious to be in power.** It becomes, therefore, **the duty of a Labour Party,** worthy of the name, **to hold itself aloof from all orthodox political Parties** except in assisting to secure legislation of a sound progressive character. It is not for the Labour Party politic to consider either the source or the intention of the promoters of legislation, but to examine closely the legislation itself and to support or oppose it as the occasion may require, without any consideration for the party which proposes it." . . .—(*Staffordshire Sentinel*, Sept. 5, 1905.)

At Derby, on October 2nd, 1905, MR. J. KEIR HARDIE, M.P., said :—

"The most the Liberal Party aspired to be was to play the part of the scavenger . . . It was true **the Liberals** were going to win the next Election—he rejoiced in it—to give them **one more chance of proving their incapacity.**"—(*Derby Daily Telegraph* (R.), October 3rd, 1905.)

At Derby, on October 2nd, 1905, MR. PHILIP SNOWDEN, Labour Parliamentary Candidate for Blackburn, said :—

"The policy of the Liberal Party would be one purely of negative criticism of their opponents, but **mere negative criticism would not satisfy those who recognised the need of social reform.**"—(*Derby Daily Telegraph* (R.), October 3rd, 1905.)

"The electors," to borrow the words of the London *Star* (R.) at the time of the last General Election, are, it would seem, merely to be asked to "merrily vote for their own damnation."

In the event of the Radical Party abandoning this attempt to come in on a negative policy, what is to be their remedy? Hitherto,

when they have deigned to suggest a prescription, it has for the most part taken the form of "more education."

As to the question whether British manufacturers or artisans are technically the inferior of other nations, Radicals are by no means agreed among themselves. The RIGHT HON. the late SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT, M.P., at Dundee, on November 25th, 1897, said :—

". . . there are weak points, no doubt, in our competition with other countries which are well deserving our attention. **Now I hear it said sometimes that all we want is more education for the working classes.** We want technical education. I do not discourage technical education. No doubt we want higher education in all classes of the community, but **I believe that it is an entire mistake to affirm that any falling off in British trade is due to any inferiority either in the manufacturers or the artisans of this country.** At this time **it is admitted that all the best goods are made in the United Kingdom. There is no dispute, I believe, upon this point.** If you will take all the higher trades requiring skill and knowledge for their development, such as the engineering trades and the great textile trades, there is not a country in the world that can produce, or does produce, a better class of articles than is produced in the United Kingdom."—(*Daily News*, November 26th, 1897.)

LORD BRASSEY and MR. HALDANE have expressed somewhat similar views. In an address at Manchester on—"The comparative Efficiency of British and Foreign Labour," LORD BRASSEY (R.), on September 27th, 1904, said :—

"He had come to the conclusion from his review that British workers are second to none. **If we had been excluded from foreign markets, it had been due not to inefficiency, but to tariffs** imposed through dread of British competition."—(*Morning Post*, September 28th, 1904.)

MR. HALDANE, K.C., M.P., Secretary of State for War, in an interview published in the *Daily Mail* of July 1st, 1903, said :—

"I am convinced from my comparatively slight observation of the two countries" (*i.e.*, England and Germany) **"that our manufacturers have more dash, more individuality, and greater commercial gifts than their rivals in Germany. Given that equality of opportunity, they will beat any competitors,** except possibly those of the United States, who are of the same blood."

MR. BRYCE, M.P., MR. PERKS, M.P., and other Radicals have diagnosed the cause of the disease differently.

On November 30th, 1903, at Aberdeen, the Right Hon. J. Bryce, M.P., now Chief Secretary for Ireland, said :—

"But it was also true that there were classes in our commercial and industrial community who did not work nearly as hard as our competitors worked in Germany and the United States. In England, for instance, young business men certainly did not work anything like as hard as young business men in Germany. They did not think about their work, and put their backs into it, as the young men in Germany; and the English manufacturers to a great extent were not as keen in pushing their business. . . . There were certain evils also which were clogs and hindrances to our industrial progress, and were more common among us than in Germany and America. There was far more drunkenness in this country than in Germany or America, and that was the greatest of all the hindrances to our progress, and the cause of the greatest amount of social waste, and the diminution of wealth and of industrial powers. There was far more passion, particularly in England, for what was called sport, far more occupation of people's minds in looking at games, reading about them, and betting about them, than in Germany or America. They would not find in the German and American papers anything like so much sporting intelligence, or among any class of clerks and storekeepers, or the class of young employers and working men, so much betting as he was sorry to say was found in England. That was our greatest hindrance to progress, and **he was persuaded if there was anything deficient in our present industrial progress, it was very largely due to these two forces - to the immoderate use of intoxicating liquors and to the growth of the pernicious habit of betting.**"—(*Aberdeen Free Press* (R.), December 1st, 1903.)

On February 7th, 1905, at Northgate, Mr. R. W. Perks, M.P., said :—

". . . He admitted that we were not keeping pace with certain foreign nations in commercial progress, and he attributed it to four things.

"UNEDUCATED.

"First, **education in this country was inferior** to that given in some foreign countries at this moment. Young people in England had not the chances given to them that were given in Germany, in France, in Austria, in Hungary and in Italy. England had been too parsimonious in her expenditure upon education, and she had not recognised its great importance as these other nations had.

"DRUNKEN.

"The second cause, in his judgment, was drink. He was not so infatuated as to suppose that a majority of people could dictate to a minority what they were to drink, or how much they were to drink, but he did say that this nation could not afford to spend £.50,000,000 a year on its drink bill. If the **working men soaked themselves with drink from Saturday night to Monday morning,** and were not in a fit condition to go to the factories and the mills on Monday morning, it must have a seriously prejudicial effect upon the commerce of this country.

"GAMBLERS.

"The third reason for the present condition of affairs was sport **—gambling, racing and inordinate sport.** They would find 20,000 people paying gate money at Blackburn on Saturday to see the final tie. This country could not afford to spend the time and the money it did on sport, and it certainly could not afford to support the gambling which went on from the lowest to the highest.

"AND LAZY.

". . . The fourth reason was laziness. It was not a palatable doctrine to the working men of the country, but he honestly believed that one of the causes for the position of affairs was laziness. People **did not work hard enough;** he did not say that they ought not to be paid more, he would pay every man the full rate of wages for all he did, but they could not afford to go to their offices at ten o'clock in the morning and leave them at five o'clock in the afternoon. **They must have harder work.** They must have a more temperate nation, a more thrifty nation, and they must have an educated nation."—(*Louth and North Lincolnshire Advertiser* (R.), February 11th, 1905.)

It is improbable that, as the General Election draws near, Mr. Bryce's and Mr. Perks' views will receive much open support from members of the Radical Party. The importance of higher and technical Education is apparent to every thinking man. Certainly, the late Unionist Government cannot, with any shadow of foundation, be accused of neglecting a matter of such manifest importance. Assuming that, as admitted in many of the following speeches by the Radicals, our trade, with which the social condition of the country is inextricably involved, is declining, either relatively or absolutely, technical education as a **sole** remedy is wholly insufficient. The reasons have been dealt with elsewhere, and the principal comprise the two following, viz. :—

1. The object of foreign tariffs is to exclude; consequently, any advantage England might gain in foreign Protected markets from superior education would at once be counterbalanced by an increase in foreign tariffs.

2. (And infinitely the most important reason, in the case of England). If her commerce, on which it is common ground depends her position, is really on the wane, England will have lost her position among the chief Powers of the world long before a generation educated under a new system can grow up and take their position at the head of affairs.

According to the RIGHT HON. J. BRYCE, M.P., now Chief Secretary for Ireland, and formerly President of the Board of Trade, we have "not been long enough improving our scientific instruction to feel the effects, which he hoped and believed would **in 10 or 15 years' time begin** to make themselves manifest."—(Aberdeen, November 30th, 1903. *Aberdeen Free Press* (R.), December 1st, 1903.)

Some improvement is merely, according to Mr. Bryce, to begin to manifest itself in the years 1914 or 1919, when, according to Lord Rosebery, "the decline of British trade" was a fit and proper subject for inquiry as far back as 1896.

The other "remedies" for the diseases admitted in the following speeches appear to consist of a *réchauffé* of the old Newcastle programme, the value of which the country has already had an opportunity of judging between the years 1892 and 1895, and which it rejected in 1896.

This SIR HENRY CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN has re-adopted at Newcastle, on May 18th, 1905, and declared that they must "do their best to carry that old policy into effect."—(*Times*, May 19th, 1905.)

With regard to this the RIGHT HON. A. J. BALFOUR, M.P., speaking at Edinburgh on November 14th, 1895, said:—

"Has Lord Rosebery, or have those who follow him, shown either the slightest talent or the slightest desire for a constructive policy? They mean to drop, apparently, some part of the Newcastle programme. **They might drop every item of it, and they would not interfere with constructive legislation.** What have these gentlemen done in the past to make us believe that they can build up in the future? **Was Home Rule a constructive policy?** The vivisection of the British Empire—was that a constructive policy? **The destruction of the Church—was that a constructive policy? The abolition of the House of Lords** without the pretence, without the shadow of a scheme to put anything in its place—was that a constructive policy? No, Lord Rosebery is of opinion, rightly or wrongly, that the past of the party which he leads is a past of destruction, and as that past has been, so far as I am able to judge, so is the future likely to be.—(*Times*, Nov. 15th, 1895.)

The Radicals have, as is shown hereafter, stated their opinion that much is in need of repair, both commercially and socially.

Is the country at the next General Election to be invited, in the face of admissions such as these, to return the Radical Party to power

with a "blank cheque"? If not, is the intelligent section of the electorate to be satisfied with perorations in regard to Education, either as the **sole** remedy for the grave condition admitted by the Radicals, or interlarded with items taken from the old "Newcastle Programme" of 1891? Is it not for the leaders of the Radical Party to specify in the clearest possible terms what they propose to do if returned to power, or rather, is it not for the Electors to enforce such a declaration of policy?

MR. KEIR HARDIE STATES THE WAR IS NOT THE CAUSE OF UNEMPLOYMENT.

In Kensington, Liverpool, on January 25th, 1905, Mr. J. Keir Hardie, M.P., said:—

"All sorts of fantastic explanations were brought forward concerning unemployment. The recent war in South Africa was given the other night by Mr. Morley* to his constituents. It was the most fantastic explanation to which he had yet seen any public man commit himself. During the war he said numbers of men were drawn into the labour market. When the war ended the abnormal demand for their labour ceased, and then men were thrown out of employment. Mr. Morley seemed to have overlooked the fact that, if they were drawn into the labour market by the war, it must have been out of the ranks of the unemployed, and that, consequently, **the war was not the cause of the men being unemployed.**"—(*Liverpool Post* (R.), January 26th, 1905.)

*This favourite Radical allegation was again repeated by Mr. Morley at Walthamstow on November 20, 1905.

CORROBORATION BY THE *Daily News*.

The *Daily News* in a leading article, on November 21st, 1905, referring to the question of the unemployed, says:—

". . . **It has to be remembered that the case was serious in 1893, before** there was any idea of **the South African war, and when the Liberal Party was responsible** for the Budget."

On November 23rd, 1904, at Guildford, MR. SYDNEY BUXTON, M.P., now Postmaster-General, said:—

"We must not be content that they (*i.e.*, a Liberal Government) **should merely maintain Free Trade,** and merely reverse the policy of the Government in regard to Education and other matters. We expect from them real and substantial reforms. . . ."—(*Surrey Times* (R.), November 26th, 1904.)

II.

SIR HENRY CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, M.P.

(First Lord of the Treasury, and Prime Minister.)

In his address to the electors of Stirling Burghs, issued September, 1900, the Right Hon. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, M.P., stated :—

"Our neighbours and rivals have forged ahead of us and have ousted us from lucrative markets; because they give their sons a systematic and intelligent education from boyhood to manhood. . . . **If we are to hold our place** this must be done, and **there is no time to be lost.**"—(*Times*, September 22nd, 1900.)

At Perth on June 5th, 1903, the Right Hon. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, M.P., said :—

"In this country we know, thanks to the patience and accurate scientific investigations of Mr. Rowntree and Mr. Charles Booth, that **there is about 30 per cent. of our population underfed, on the verge of hunger. Thirty per cent. of 41 millions comes to something over 12 millions** —almost identical as you see with the whole population of the Colonies. So that it comes to this, that for every man in the Colonies who is benefited one head is shoved under water in this country. I think I might set down that fact as almost enough of itself to condemn any scheme, however plausible. Surely **the fact that about 30 per cent. of the population is living in the grip of perpetual poverty is, or ought to be, a sufficient answer to the Prime Minister's complacent suggestion that we can now afford to try experiments** which fifty years ago were not to be thought of . . ."—(*Daily News*, June 6th, 1903.)

In the House of Commons on June 10th, 1903, the Right Hon. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, M.P., said :—

" . . . I am not aware that anyone here, I, at any rate, have not found anybody who is a fanatical devotee of the precise arrangement that was made fifty years ago. We make no fetish or object of worship either of man or of thing or of opinion. But what we do say is that **the main lines of free trade have been the settled policy of this country for all these years,** and that **in our opinion the country has prospered under them** to an extent that no other country has prospered. . . . We used to hear of a submerged tenth in the population. **We now know there is a submergeable third. . . .**"—(*Authorized Debates*, Vol. cxxiii., cols. 580 and 582.)

At Glasgow, on November 28th, 1905, the Right Hon. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, M.P., said :—

"I have never claimed for free trade—nor has any Free Trader—that it was a solution of the problem of poverty and irregularity of employment. . . . **I have no immediate** cut-and-dried, warranted, patented, ready-made **remedy** for our fellow citizens, who, through no fault of their own, are deprived of the means of earning their livelihood."—(*Daily News*, November 29th, 1905.)

LORD ROSEBERY.

(Prime Minister, 1894-1895.)

At Epsom, on July 24th, 1896, the Earl of Rosebery, K.G., said :—

"Year after year our Consuls and our various officials of the Board of Trade have called the attention of the community to the fact that we are no longer, as we once were, undisputed mistress of the world of commerce, but that we are threatened by **one very formidable rival at any rate,** who, as I daresay Mr. Aston could tell you from his City experience, **is encroaching on us as the sea encroaches on weak parts of the coast—I mean Germany.**

". . . The heads of the indictment against ourselves are three. First, that the proportion per head of exported British produce was £8 1s. in 1872, whilst it had sunk to £5 11s. 3d. in 1894. Of course you may say that reduced prices account for some part of that, but **I do not think you will find that decreased prices do account for it, when you observe the broad features of the balance of trade and also of the German increase of trade.** Secondly, the imports of German manufactured goods into Great Britain rose from £16,630,000 in 1883 to £21,630,000 in 1893—an increase of 30 per cent. in ten years of manufactured goods into this country which believed it had almost a monopoly of supplying the world with manufactured goods. The total imports of Great Britain declined in value £22,000,000 between 1883 and 1893 in gross, but the imports of manufactured articles increased by over £13,000,000. **I think these are grave and striking facts** . . . the result is that, though we have not lost our position, she (*i.e.* Germany) is slowly, and **not very slowly after all,** creeping up to us. **In some of our Colonies,** in India and in Egypt, which is under our tutelage for the present, **German trade has gravely menaced British trade** . . . There are committees and commissions of enquiry without end. Some are indefinitely postponed, but some are pressing and immediate. **Surely an enquiry might well be instituted,** which might be short, which might be practical, and which might be exhaustive, **into the causes of the decline of British trade and the alarming increase of our foreign rivals.**"—(*Times*, July 25th, 1896.)

At Edinburgh, on 4th April, 1900, the Earl of Rosebery, K.G., said :—

"Have they" (*i.e.*, foreign nations) "realized what the free trade of the Empire means to their merchants? Why, **we know in how many parts of the world, partly owing to our free trade,** partly owing to our generous encouragement of other nations, **their commerce is beginning to push ours out.**"—(*Times*, April 5th, 1900.)

At the meeting of the Chamber of Commerce at Burnley, on May 19th, 1903, the Earl of Rosebery, K.G., said :—

". . . he thought it could not be denied that under a system of free trade large tracts of country had been turned out of cultivation, that our own food supply had been diminished, and that the populations which had been reared in the rural districts had ceased to be reared in those districts; and he feared that they would not be so again reared until some possible change could be devised. He was not, however, going to dwell upon that aspect of the subject to-night. He was only showing them that **he was not a person who believed that free trade was part of the Sermon on the Mount, and that we ought to receive it in all its rigidity as a divinely-appointed dispensation.**"—(*Times*, May 20th, 1903.)

On November 7th, 1903, at Leicester, the Earl of Rosebery, K.G., said :—

"**Who has said that all is well now?** That is not the doctrine that I am here to preach. All well! God forbid! **How can we say that all is well?** Agriculture, I admit, is in a crippled condition. . . . Can any of us be blind to the hideous curse of intemperance, which hinders our progress as a nation far more than any hostile tariffs? **Are we so blind as not to see almost annually the great procession of the unemployed,** due, I think, very largely to the almost insane migration from the country into the towns; but nevertheless **a blot on our social system which will prevent the most animated optimist in the world from saying 'All is well.'** No, Sir, **we have our curses, we have our drawbacks, we have our evils;** but the remedy is not Protection."—(*The Daily News*, November 9th, 1903.)

In Penzance, on November 22nd, 1905, the Earl of Rosebery, K.G., said :—

"I have no time to enlarge upon that problem (*i.e.*, the unemployed) to-night, and if I were to speak to you for hours upon it **I have no remedy to offer.** I know very well—we all know—that grim and ghastly spectacle of want of employment and of starving people in the great centres of population, that rises every winter before us in more or less horror. . . . Subscriptions and charity are a palliative, not a remedy . . . **it is not at all a satisfactory condition of things that so many thousands of people should find themselves workless and homeless.**"—(*Daily News*, November 23rd, 1905.)

MR. J. MORLEY, M.P.

(Secretary of State for India.)

In the 1st manifesto issued by the Right Hon. J. Morley, M.P., to the Electors of Montrose Burghs in 1900, Mr. Morley states :—

"Our real and deep danger is the loss of our industrial supremacy, already not out of reach of challenge."—(*Standard*, September 24th, 1900.)

In the 2nd manifesto issued by the Right Hon. J. Morley, M.P., to the Electors of Montrose Burghs in 1900, Mr. Morley states :—

"There is not a man versed in our national affairs who does not see and know . . . that giant rivals are slowly but surely springing up against us in all the markets of the world . . . ."—(*Morning Post*, October 5th, 1900.)

At Manchester, on October 19th, 1903, the Right Hon. J. Morley, M.P., said :—

"**It is a matter of life and death to you to persuade foreign nations to rally to that free trade flag,** because it is the flag, after all, of civilized intercourse between nations. What do you think they are going to do in face of this turnabout in this country, which has not yet come off? **Gentlemen, it is a matter of life and death to us that they should come round to the open door.** How do you get them to come round to the policy of the open door? How do you persuade them that free trade is the best policy for them, when you go forth, blatant, and say, 'Oh, no! Free trade is all a mistake, the Free Hall in Manchester ought to be pulled down; it is all a mistake, and the right policy is protection."—(*Times*, October 20th, 1903.)

In the House of Commons, on February 8th, 1904, the Right Hon. J. Morley, M.P., said :—

"Well, now, the Chancellor of the Exchequer on Tuesday last referred to some language I had used, implying that the state of the industries of the country was not all that we could desire. **I have always held for the last eight years the same language. I agree with the right hon. gentleman the Member for West Birmingham on this point. I have said it again and again, both inside this House and outside this House.** There is a great deal in the state of commerce and industry, and of the employment of our population, which must give every serious and observant man plenty of food for reflection. I have always in the country wound up with the declaration of the late Lord Salisbury, which was that there is ground for anxiety, that no statesman can look around and see these new conditions without anxiety. . . ."—(*Authorized Debates*, Vol. cxxix., col. 626.)

The Right Hon. J. Morley, M.P., speaking at the Merchants' Club, Chicago, U.S.A., on November 9th, 1904, said :—

"The prophecy that the United States was to be the greatest Power on earth was coming true."—(*Morning Post*, November 11th, 1904.)

At Walthamstow, on November 20th, 1905, the Right Hon. J. Morley, M.P., said :—

"**On the question of the unemployed,** if you think I have come here to-night to offer you a remedy, I have come under false colours. **I have no remedy.** Let us look at what the other people say. For myself, I have no remedy."—(*Daily News*, November 21st, 1905.)

MR. H. H. ASQUITH, K.C., M.P.

(Chancellor of the Exchequer.)

At the Banquet of the Associated Chambers of Commerce in London, on March 14th, 1894, the Right Hon. H. H. Asquith, K.C., M.P., said :—

"**English trade in these days carried on its operations under great, formidable, and increasing difficulties; the wall of tariffs which excluded us from foreign markets was every day becoming higher and higher,** and side by side with these hostile and aggressive manifestations we found every day that in activity of industrial energy and industrial equipment our rivals became keener."—(*Daily News*, March 15th, 1894.)

On November 23rd, 1900, at the Meeting of the Leeds Incorporated Chamber of Commerce, the Right Hon. H. H. Asquith, K.C., M.P., said :—

"It was easy to show by statistics judged by any available tests—imports and exports, railway returns, bank deposits, the yield of taxation, the level of wages of labour, the average standard of comfort—that both the volume of our trade and the aggregate of our national wealth had reached an unprecedented figure. But **the question still remained, are we holding our own?** In answering that question we found ourselves confronted by two new factors, the emergency of which was the cardinal point in the history of national trade during the last half century. He referred to the stepping out from the rear to the front ranks of Germany and of the United States of America. He would not attempt to discuss that much vexed question of the extent and degree of injury done to British trade by foreign competition. **So far from enjoying the undisputed hegemony which was so confidently predicted for British trade fifty years**

ago, there was not an inch of ground in any one of the international markets for which we were not fighting with all our available strength. . . . That in face of such odds we had done as well as we had was to be set down first to the industrial qualities, native and acquired, of our people, both capitalists and workmen. . . . Germany, for industrial purposes, was **not** a country exceptionally favoured by nature, and he confessed for his part that the rise of Germany into the front rank of the Commercial Powers of the world was the most remarkable illustration that was to be found of the practical value of Education, organization and concentration."—(*Daily News*, November 24th, 1900.)

At Cinderford, on October 8th, 1903, the Right Hon. H. H. Asquith, K.C., M.P., said :—

"Do not, however—and this shall be my final word—**do not let it be supposed that** because we are driven to defend the citadel of free trade **we,** therefore, **think that all is for the best,** and are content with a policy of folded hands. **That there are disquieting features in our industrial as in our social conditions no honest observer,** certainly no member of the party of progress, **will be found to deny. We have seen industries in which we ought to have maintained our supremacy falling behind, and in some cases entirely taken away from us by our competitors** . . . True it is also that, in spite of the continuous growth of our national prosperity, we still have with us the unemployed, the ill-fed, the aged poor; but here again let us look to natural and not to artificial remedies. Instead of raising the price of bread, let us try to raise the standard of life. Temperance, better housing, the tenure and taxation of land, these are matters as to which we have allowed our legislation to fall deplorably into arrear."—(From the personally revised edition of his speeches issued in 1903 by Mr. Asquith, and published by Methuen and Co.)

At Newcastle-on-Tyne, on October 24th, 1903, the Right Hon. H. H. Asquith, K.C., M.P., said :—

"I do not deny—no Free Trader denies—that Protectionist Tariffs are a hindrance to the natural extension and distribution of the world's industry. They involve, they may involve, particular trades which are specially aimed at by them in loss, and even under conceivable circumstances in decay . . ."—(From the personally revised edition of his speeches issued by Mr. Asquith in 1903, and published by Methuen and Co.)

At Ladybank, East Fife, on October 8th, 1904, the Right Hon. H. H. Asquith, K.C., M.P., said :—

"**Here we were, forty millions of people, hard pressed in the industrial rivalry of the world, finding it difficult enough** with the intelligent industry of our people, the stored-up capital of many generations, and our knowledge, scientific and applied, **to hold our own** . . ."—(*Times*, October 10th 1904.)

At Inverness, on October 21st, 1904, the Right Hon. H. H. Asquith, K.C., M.P., said :—

"**They had never said at any stage of the controversy that under the existing social and industrial conditions all was for the best. He had made a great many speeches on the fiscal question, but had never spoken without pointing out that the country was hard pressed in the race for industrial rivalry,** and that, if it were to hold its own, it could not be by simply folding its hands and living upon the past."—(*Times*, October 22nd, 1904.)

At Basingstoke, on November 7th, 1905, the Right Hon. H. H. Asquith, K.C., M.P., said :—

"There had been during these years that our exports had been increasing undoubtedly in other trades and in other parts of the country depression, unemployment, pauperism, misery, and their attendant evils."—(*Daily News*, November 8th, 1905.)

LORD SPENCER.

(First Lord of the Admiralty, 1892-1895.)

On February 2nd, 1904, in the House of Lords, Earl Spencer, K.G., said :—

". . . I admit some changes may be necessary, for we have to meet a keen and active competition from other nations, and must look to ourselves, and see that we are fully armed for the struggle."—(*Authorized Debates*, Vol. cxxix., col. 36.)

LORD RIPON.

(Lord Privy Seal.)

At Hampden, on June 25th, 1903, the Marquess of Ripon, K.G., said :—

"There was yet another class. The very poorest class—the submerged class. Probably they were not so well known in country life, but they knew them only too well in London, and all their large towns and cities. They were **just on the verge of starvation.** They got little or no wages, and no rise in wages would affect them. . . . the submerged class to which he had just alluded, **was estimated at about 13,000,000.**"—(*Bucks Advertiser* (R.), June 27th, 1903.)

MR. R. B. HALDANE, K.C., M.P.

(Secretary of State for War.)

On October 5th, 1903, at Prestonpans, the Right Hon. R. B. Haldane, K.C., M.P., said :—

"He did not deny for a moment that there were many manufacturers who felt the pressure of hostile tariffs. . . . He could point to trade after trade which we had lost which we ought to have kept. He would name only the chemical industry as one which had been lost by the ignorance

of our manufacturers, who had let themselves be far outstripped by the Germans. . . . . **Some industries had undoubtedly decreased,** but that was due to the fact that we no longer had a practical monopoly; other nations had begun to manufacture for themselves."—(*Haddingtonshire Courier*, October 9th, 1903.)

At Perth, on October 22nd, 1903, the Right Hon. R. B. Haldane, K.C., M.P., said:—

"Upon one point I find myself in agreement with Mr. Chamberlain. Like him, I think there are a good many things to mend in the condition of British commerce. For seven years past some of us have been mourning, as he is mourning, that British trades have slipped away from this country. . . . I think there is something to bemoan in the condition of certain British industries. I agree with Mr. Chamberlain that it is serious; but while I am aware, as he is, of the source of the disease, I differ with him as to the diagnosis."—(*Perthshire Courier*, October 27th, 1903.)

At the Caxton Hall, Westminster, on November 12th, 1903, the Right Hon. R. B. Haldane, K.C., M.P., said:—

"He (Mr. Haldane) had never denied, and no sensible person would deny, that there were many industries which had been hard hit by foreign tariffs, but it was nothing new to find industries hard hit by foreign tariffs, nor was it anything new to appeal to Parliament for Protection . . . **There was certainly something that was not very satisfactory in the condition of British trade, and to him (Mr. Haldane) it was a matter of rejoicing that this question should have come to the front . . . He agreed with Mr. Chamberlain that something was wrong,** but he was not agreed with him as to the diagnosis of the disease . . . He was not one of those who rolled themselves up in the traditions of the past and thought there was nothing to be done . . . **He agreed that certain of our manufactures were down,** and others were up, but his proposition was that the cause of the defects was one of method, which the State could do much to remedy. And **it was the sacred duty of any party responsible for the defence of this country to seek a remedy . . . We were not to be beaten anywhere, not even in the United States, if our manufactures got a fair chance.** But there was something more to be done besides education. **The British workman had to learn,** as well as the British manufacturer, **and had to be brought into line in this matter as well as the manufacturers** . . . the remedy for declining trade would be found in social legislation, in improved methods of manufacture, and in an improved constitution for the Empire, and these things offered ample scope for the energies of the Liberal Party in the future."—(*Daily Chronicle*, November 13th, 1903.)

At Carshalton, on December 17th, 1903, the Right Hon. R. B. Haldane, K.C., M.P., said:—

"We used to have the manufacturing trade of the whole world. The United States and Germany, with their unrivalled resources, **were competing against** us. How could we pretend to be in the same race with the United States, that enormous territory with its mineral resources, or even Germany which though not quite so great, was far greater than we were."—(*Croydon Herald*, December 19th, 1903.)

On February 8th, 1904, in the House of Commons, the Right Hon. R. B. Haldane K.C., M.P., said:—

"The right hon. gentleman the member for Montrose (Mr. Morley) admitted that he did not find the trade of this country in a wholly satisfactory condition. He (Mr. Haldane) was quite unable to agree with those who found in the prosperity of the country anything which could give them complete assurance for the future. He held strongly that there never was a time at which this nation more required to make an effort if they wished to retain the supremacy which had distinguished them in the past, and which it lay with them as to whether it should remain with this country in the future."—(*Authorized Debates*, Vol. cxxix., col. 697.)

SIR EDWARD GREY, BART., M.P.

(Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.)

On October 22nd, 1903, at Alnwick, the Right Hon. Sir Edward Grey, Bart., M.P., said:—

". . . The United States, with its vast undeveloped resources and growing population, was bound to increase, and would increase by leaps and bounds. When he came to Germany, he admitted the progress which had been made in trade, but he did not think it was due to 'Protection' . . . That they had made progress was not a matter of surprise or astonishment to him nor a matter of alarm."—(*Alnwick Guardian* (R.), October 24th, 1903.)

On November 4th, 1903, at Gainsborough, the Right Hon. Sir Edward Grey, Bart., M.P., said:—

"I admit that the success and prosperity of the United States has lately been remarkable. I admit, though in a less degree, the German progress has been remarkable."—(*Gainsborough Leader* (R.), November 5th, 1903.)

On November 23rd, 1903, at Salisbury, the Right Hon. Sir Edward Grey, Bart., M.P., said:—

"I admit much more needs to be done. **Our contention with Mr. Chamberlain is NOT that all things are perfect,** but that his remedy would make things worse instead of better."—(*Salisbury Times* (R.), November 27th, 1903.)

On November 25th, 1904, at Hastings, the Right Hon. Sir Edward Grey, Bart., M.P. said:—

"Much needs doing to strengthen the country, and to make it prosperous."—(*Hastings Mail* (R.), November 26th, 1904.)

SIR R. REID, K.C., M.P.

(The Lord Chancellor.)

At Kirkcudbright, on August 10th, 1903, the Right Hon. Sir R. Reid, K.C., M.P., said :—

"There is not the least doubt that some industries are less prosperous than they were . . . I am not painting a rose-coloured picture of **the condition of the country. It is not very satisfactory to a great many people, nor to me.** If you were to enter upon it in detail you would find many shades, dark shadows if you like. . . ." (*Dumfries and Galloway Standard* (R.), August 12th, 1903.)

At Kirkcudbright, on August 10th, 1903, the Right Hon. Sir R. Reid, K.C., M.P., said :—

"I look about in figures and statistics, in the condition of our country to see what it is that has produced this bolt from the blue. Well, **there is not the least doubt about one thing. If you look at the condition of certain classes of the population here, it is very far from satisfactory. The social condition of too great a percentage of our people is far from satisfactory.** You are acquainted with investigations made by Mr. Rowntree in the city of York, and of Mr. Booth in London. The statements they make show that **something like twenty-eight per cent. of the population are never safe from want. These figures have never been contradicted,** but they have been challenged. I am quite prepared to make a deduction, and if you make a slight deduction, **it still leaves a very deplorable state of things.** And there is no doubt that a considerable number of persons in this country are far from that state of social comfort in which all of us, whatever our political opinions may be, would desire to see them. **There is a great deal of poverty, a great deal too much poverty. I mean there is more poverty than is due to vice.** There is more poverty than can be accounted for by vice or intemperance in this country. And **it is no answer to say things are better, than they were, unless you can say things are as good as you can make them.**"—(*Dumfries and Galloway Standard* (R.), August 12th, 1903.)

MR. HERBERT J. GLADSTONE, M.P.

(The Home Secretary.)

At Slaithwaite, on October 16th, 1903, the Right Hon. Herbert Gladstone, M.P., said :—

"The Liberal party did not say that Free Traders were altogether content. They did not reject Mr. Chamberlain's policy because they thought that all was well, and that they had only to sit down and twiddle their thumbs under the system of Free Trade, which had worked well during the last 60 years. . . . **There was plenty of room for improvement . .**"—(*Huddersfield Examiner* (R.), October 17th, 1903.)

At Newferry, on December 22nd, 1903, the Right Hon. Herbert Gladstone, M.P., said :—

"He (the speaker) never thought Free Trade was a counsel of perfection that would guard against all difficulties and dangers. . . ."—(*Liverpool Daily Post* (R.), December 23rd, 1903.)

On December 28th, 1903, in Chester, the Right Hon. Herbert Gladstone, M.P., said :—

"He did not say it" (*i.e.*, the Inquiry Blue-Book) "showed that everything was right, and nothing was wrong. He did not say we had not some weaknesses and dangers. . . ."—(*Chester Chronicle* (R.), January 2nd, 1904.)

On December, 5th, 1904, in West Leeds, the Right Hon. Herbert Gladstone, M.P., said :—

"There was another important question, that of the unemployed. . . . **The difficulty was a growing one from year to year.** It was productive of great individual hardships where hardships were totally undeserved, and a great social evil as well . . . there were hundreds and thousands of labourers in the country who, on their labourers' wages, could not afford to lay by money. Was it right, was it fair, was it wise to say they could not help it, they would subscribe to funds, and there were the workhouses? Was it wise to sit down under the present system in a happy-go-lucky way **while these evils were growing? . . . When times were bad they had a vast army of 300,000 bread winners out of work through no fault of their own.**"—(*Yorkshire Daily Observer* (R.), December 6th, 1904.)

In Leeds, on February 8th, 1905, the Right Hon. Herbert Gladstone, M.P., said :—

"First of all it was inevitable that this difficulty of the unemployed should recur again and again: it was a necessary consequence of the national industrial system."—(*Leeds Mercury* (R.), February 9th, 1905.)

At Leeds, on November 7th, 1905, the Right Hon. Herbert Gladstone, M.P., said :—

"He was not satisfied, any more than others were, with the present condition of our commerce, trade, industry, and social well-being; but if they thought they were in the frying-pan that was no reason why they should jump into the fire."—(*Daily News*, November 8th, 1905.)

MR. J. BRYCE, M.P.

(Chief Secretary for Ireland.)

At Aberdeen, on June 10th, 1897, the Right Hon. J. Bryce, M.P., said :—

"If we looked at the results of the material well-being of the people, we had also reason to be satisfied. **A great deal remained to be done,** and it was also true that we, who lived in towns, must feel that **the country, to some extent, had not fully shared in those benefits. He always thought with regret of the comparative depopulation of our country districts, and thought our system**

could not be satisfactory while there was such a continual indraft of population from the country to the towns, while the country folk were still comparatively backward in many places in their dwellings, in their educational facilities, and in the means of comfort and enjoyment which they possessed . . . As regarded the towns . . . still there did remain a certain section of the population with whose condition they must be dissatisfied, and **there remained at all times, when trade was depressed, a considerable margin of working men who were apt to be in serious difficulties, for want of work, and also serious difficulties for want of food and want of comfort. As long as these things lasted, they must not be satisfied with the progress made,** and only stimulated to go on further in the work of trying to make this country of ours, favoured in so many ways by nature, history, and fortune, a still worthier home for the people who inhabit it."—(*Daily Free Press*, June 11th, 1897.)

At Halifax, on October 7th, 1903, the Right Hon. J. Bryce, M.P., said :—

"He was bound to admit that in certain departments of business, and in certain markets, there had been an absence of that elasticity which existed at certain previous periods . . . It might be that our progress now, relatively with that of other countries, was not what it had been."—(*Halifax Courier* (R.), October 8th, 1903.)

SIR HENRY H. FOWLER, M.P.

(Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster.)

At Wolverhampton, on November 15th, 1904, the Right Hon. Sir H. Fowler, M.P. said :—

"There was no doubt that a large section of the community were anxious to cement and develop our commercial relationships with our Colonies, as well as **justly anxious to resent and resist the heavy import duties levied on English manufactures in certain foreign countries, and which practically disabled us from competing in some of these countries with the home producer;** but there was a serious question whether it was wise or worth while to replace our present system of free imports by colonial preference."—(*Times*, November 16th, 1904.)

LORD WELBY.

(Permanent Secretary to the Treasury, 1885-1894.)

In the House of Lords on July 3rd, 1902, Lord Welby (R.) said :—

" . . . There is, as we have learned from the searching and exhaustive enquiries of men like Mr. Charles Booth, and Mr. Rowntree, an enormous proportion—nearly 30 **per cent.**—of **our population** in the great cities who are unable to procure sufficient nutritive food to keep themselves in bodily vigour. Therefore, **there is a dangerous fallacy underlying the statement that England is a rich country. It has been clearly shown** by these men who have devoted their lives to investigating the position of the poorer classes **that it is with the greatest difficulty that a large class of our population are able to keep body and soul together** . . ."—(*Authorized Parliamentary Debates*, Vol. ex., col. 650.)

LORD CREWE.

(Lord President of the Council.)

On October 17th, 1903, at Crewe, the Earl of Crewe said :—

"Of course they would find cases where individual people have suffered in individual trades, probably indirectly owing to the effects of foreign competition. That could not be denied, and might be caused probably through prohibitive duties . . . "—(*Crewe Chronicle*, October 24th, 1903.)

SIR CHARLES DILKE, BART., M.P.

(President of the Local Government Board, 1882-1885.)

At Ashton-under-Lyne, on January 25th, 1904, Sir Charles Dilke, M.P., said :—

"The prosperity argument was a natural argument in the mouth of a Conservative Unionist, but it was not a wise one, especially for Liberals who belonged to the advanced section of the party. Their life and being had their origin in discontent and dissatisfaction with existing conditions which they wished to remedy, and it was contrary to the whole law of their political life for them to take as their main doctrine the prosperity of the people. He thought it was a dangerous argument."—(*Ashton-under-Lyne Reporter*, January 30th, 1904.)

On February 10th, 1904, in the House of Commons, Sir Charles Dilke, M.P., said :—

"The Radicals thought the prosperity argument had been pushed too far, for it was one which struck at the very root of Radicalism, of which the foundation lay in the sufferings of the people. They knew of those sufferings which stood in need of drastic remedy . . . They could not urge too strongly that the prosperity argument was a dangerous one which would be turned against them."—(*Authorized Debates*, Vol. cxxix., col. 865.)

MR. L. H. COURTNEY.

(Chairman of Committees, 1886-1892.)

At the Royal Statistical Society, in London, on December 14th, 1897, the Right Hon. Leonard H. Courtney, M.P., said :—

"The source of the great danger to our industrial supremacy, which Jevons detected, lay in the United States. There might be in other quarters centres of development out of which industries might grow, nullifying the possibility of the importation of our manufactures within the surrounding areas; but **from the United States might be expected developments of production that might drive us from neutral markets, and indeed turn back the tide of commerce upon our shores.** At the time Jevons wrote, we produced 86,000,000 of tons of coal, against 16,000,000 by the United States, but in 1896 the United States had increased their output to 170,000,000 of tons, against 195,000,000 by Great Britain . . . In 1860,

the production of iron in the United States was 821,000 tons; it reached 9,400,000 tons in 1895. In Great Britain in 1860, the production was 4⅔ times as great as in the United States, whereas in 1895 our production was to theirs as 77 to 94, or a little less than five-sixths. **This growth of the iron industry had been largely stimulated by protective duties. The United States had advanced with extraordinary rapidity in the production of coal and iron,** till they had come abreast of this country. . . . The review of the facts of experience, therefore, since Jevons wrote, seemed to him to justify abundantly his prognostications. **The most careless,** when brought face to face with the facts he had quoted, **must see how idle was the optimism which men of repute appeared to think good enough for public platforms.** They were assured that the position of Great Britain could not be endangered as long as the energy and character of its inhabitants remained unimpaired, but no excellence of character could make men independent of the circumstances in which they were placed . . . no endowment of energy and character could prevail in face of a struggle in which they were handicapped by greater facilities of production abroad."—(*Times*, December 15th, 1897.)

In the *Contemporary Review* for August, 1903, the Right Hon. Leonard H. Courtney, late M.P. (R.) for Bodmin Division, Cornwall, writes:—

"I have myself urged that our leadership in the industry of the world was passing away. . . . **We have already ceased to be first** in more than one commanding department."

MR. A. BIRRELL, K.C.

(President of the Board of Education.)

In his Election Address for North-East Manchester, dated September, 1900, Mr. Augustine Birrell, K.C. (Chairman of the National Liberal Federation and Radical M.P. for West Fifeshire, 1889-1900), stated:—

"**Nor is the condition of our trade satisfactory. We are losing, if we have not already lost, our supremacy in many markets. Leaving the United States of America out of consideration, the growth of the manufacturing and trading towns in Germany strikes the most unobservant traveller with amazement,** whilst their technical schools and colleges put ours to the blush."—(*Manchester Guardian*, September 21st, 1900.)

MR. DAVID L. GEORGE, M.P.

(President of the Board of Trade.)

On November 19th, 1903, at Falkirk, Mr. David L. George, M.P., said:—

"Agriculture had been hit very hard, and hit hard by foreign competition. There was no use denying that."—(*Falkirk Herald*, November 21st, 1903.)

On November 19th, 1903, in Falkirk, Mr. George, M.P., said:—

"If the Liberals got into power—and they were going to get into power—what were they going to do? It was not enough merely to resist fiscal revolution, and merely to reverse the decision of the present Parliament on Education. They had got to do something for the people who returned them to power. Nobody said there was no discontent; nobody said there was no ground for discontent. It was part of the policy of every reformer, and part of the principles on which he formed his policy, that if there was anything wrong, any misery and any injustice in this country, it had got to be righted, and **in resisting Mr. Chamberlain's policy, let them not rush to the other extreme, and say that all was well** with everything in this country. **It was not.** The only thing they said to Mr. Chamberlain was not that there was nothing wrong, but that he was going the wrong way to right it."—(*Falkirk Herald*, November 21st, 1903.)

On February 10th, 1904, in the House of Commons, Mr. George, M.P., said:—

"He agreed with the Hon. Member who had said that there was a great deal of suffering in this country, and we had got to do something to meet it. No Liberal Member denied that. The Amendment of the Right Hon. Gentleman, the Member for Montrose" (Mr. Morley) "affirmed the principle that we looked to meet that suffering by social reform."—(*Authorized Debates*, Vol. cxxix., col. 953.)

On October 21st, 1904, at Hereford, Mr. George, M.P., said:—

"He agreed with a speaker in the room that agriculture had been hard hit, and was an industry that had gone down most."—(*Hereford Times* (R.), October 22nd, 1904.)

MR. JOHN BURNS, M.P.

(President of the Local Government Board.)

At Clapham, on November 25th, 1905, the Right Hon. John Burns, M.P., said:—

"The man who told them that he could give them a solution to the unemployed problem to-morrow morning was either a charlatan or a fool. **He had no** such **remedy,** nor had the Socialist Party in Battersea."—(*Daily News*, November 27th, 1905.)

MR. A. B. MARKHAM, M.P.

In a letter to *The Times* of October 26th, 1903, Mr. Arthur B. Markham, M.P., writes:—

"**I have told my constituents that the exports of manufactured goods are declining, and show a decrease per head of the population,** and Lord Rosebery cannot prove this statement to be untrue unless the Board of Trade returns are incorrect. A business man does not value his business by the profits or losses of any single year, but by results spread over a term of years. **It is strange that politicians ignore the growth of population when dealing with the question of imports and exports. The population in these islands has increased during the past 37 years from 29 millions to 42 millions, and it surely ought not to be necessary to say that this increased population requires more food, clothing, and employment; yet this simple fact is studiously ignored by politicians.**"

MR. R. W. PERKS, M.P.

On February 7th, 1905, at a Baptist sale of work in Northgate Baptist Chapel, Mr. R. W. Perks, M.P., said :—

"**. . . He admitted that we were not keeping pace with certain foreign nations in commercial progress,** and he attributed it to four things."—(*Louth and North Lincolnshire Advertiser* (R.), February 11th, 1905.)

MR. J. KEIR HARDIE, M.P.

At Cleethorpes, near Grimsby, on May 10th, 1905, Mr. J. Keir Hardie, M.P., said :—

"What did free traders ask? They said—'Don't step back fifty years, but stand still and mark time,' like the Militiaman practising the goose step. **Standing still and marking time was not going to solve the social problem. They had had half a century of Free Trade, and at the end of it what was the condition of the people? Thirty-three per cent. of them,** during periods of good trade, **were receiving less than would keep them in any reasonable position of efficiency and comfort.** Many thought that if those people were in poverty it was because of their drinking and thriftless habits. He did not want to mimimise the evil which drunkenness inflicted upon the people. It aggravated poverty, it accentuated every problem with which they were face to face, but he could not allow teetotalers and temperance reformers to continue under the mistaken impression that it was intemperance which caused poverty. That was not the case. The investigations of Charles Booth, in London, of Mr. Rowntree in York, and of Mr. Mann in Bedford, had produced conclusions which could be neither challenged nor questioned, and which showed clearly that **poverty was due to low wages and irregular employment,** and that all that drink did was to aggravate the poverty which those two causes produced. Charles Booth stated that it took £1 1s. per week to maintain a family in physical efficiency in London, and there were 360,000 families in London where the income of the whole household, when in full work, was less than £1 1s. per week . . . **They wanted a party with a constructive policy;** a party that would protect childhood; that would give to manhood a full and free opportunity to earn a livelihood by honest labour; a party that would throw the shield of public support around the aged worker and protect him from the degradation and infamy of our Poor-law and workhouse system."—(*The Grimsby News* (R.), May 12th, 1905.)

MR. FELIX SCHUSTER.

In East Finsbury, on June 22nd, 1905, Mr. Felix Schuster (Free Trade Candidate for Parliament for the City of London), said :—

"**It could not be denied that** our manufacturers had fallen somewhat behind in the struggle with competitors, and that **foreign tariffs seriously interfered with their business.**"—(*Morning Post*, June 23rd, 1905.)

MISCELLANEOUS RADICAL STATEMENTS.

The "Handbook for the General Election," entitled "Current Politics from the Liberal Standpoint," published in 1905 by the "Scottish Liberal Association" and the "Liberal Publication Department," states (p. 121) :—

"Mr. Rowntree, as the result of careful investigations into the condition of the working classes in York **(which may fairly be taken as typical of town life generally)** shows that **43·4 per cent. of the wage-earning classes,** and 27·84 per cent. of the total population of York, **were living in poverty,** *i.e.*, **their earnings were insufficient to enable them to obtain the minimum necessaries** for merely physical efficiency. If these figures, or anything like them, are capable of general application (and there seems to be nothing peculiarly in the case of York) **some 30 per cent. of the town population have to find the money to meet these food taxes by restricting themselves to less food than is necessary properly to sustain life."**

"A Handbook for the use of Liberals," entitled "Ten years of Tory Government," published in 1905, by the "Liberal Publication Department," states (p. 36) :—

"Protection in foreign countries, **admittedly injurious to our trade,** takes two forms (*a*) tariff walls **(which injure us),** and (*b*), bounties. . ."

On March 21st, 1905, the *Daily News* (R.), in a leading article, said :—

"It is none the less true that **a constant margin of unemployment or of short time has always been the curse of the industrial classes,** and that long ago a permanent remedy ought to have been applied."

Truth, in the letter from "The Linkman," for August 17th, 1905, states :—

"Commerce—The Americans and Germans especially are displacing us in this direction."

REPORT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE.

"The valuable Blue Book, a very Daniel come to judgment . . ."—(The Right Hon. R. B. Haldane, K.C., M.P., Prestonpans, October 5th, 1903. *Haddingtonshire Courier*, October 9th, 1903.)

The Inquiry Blue Book, issued by the Board of Trade in September, 1903 (Cd. 1761 of 1903, p. 16), states :—

"But after allowing for this **there can be no doubt as to the effect of Continental and American tariffs in checking our export trade, especially in manufactured articles, with the groups of 'protected countries' during the last two decades."**

The second series of the Inquiry Blue Book, issued by the Board of Trade in December, 1904 (Cd. 2,337 of 1904, p. 384), states :—

"The United Kingdom exports of manufactures to both groups of markets are seen to preponderate greatly in total value over those from either France or the United States, but they have not shown equal elasticity as measured by the rate of growth, and **the figures for exports to the principa protected markets show stagnation or even decline."**

DO THE RADICALS WANT A REMEDY?

In a leading article on November 21st, 1905, *The Daily News* (R.) says:—

"At last it seems as if the facts of unemployment were being brought home to the heart and mind of the nation. It was obvious that in yesterday's procession there were many workmen who might fairly be described as good-for-nothings. But the demonstration was on that account only the more serious. **How is it that the unemployed so often become good-for-nothings? The vital question at the moment is** not whether Mr. Balfour said this, or that, or the other, about tariff reform, but **what is the Liberal Party's remedy for social disorders. . . . IT IS THE BUSINESS OF LIBERAL STATESMEN TO SAY SOMETHING VERY MUCH MORE POSITIVE THAN 'I HAVE NO REMEDY,'** and if this is seriously to be the last word from the Liberal Front Bench, the reply of London will be the reply of the voice in Mr. Morley's meeting, 'You don't want a remedy.'"

Printed by JAS. TRUSCOTT & SON, LTD., Suffolk Lane, E.C.

Published by the Conservative Publication Department, St. Stephen's Chambers, Westminster, S.W., in connection with the National Union and the Conservative Central Office (705).

(C.C.O. No. 562.)

THE STORY OF THE "BIG LOAF."

The fiscal proposals of the Unionist Party do not include a tax on food.

This has been stated again and again. But Radicals have listened with their deaf ear. They go on merrily raising the war-cry of the "Big Loaf," and accusing the Unionists of intentions to demolish it.

These are tactics that are purposely misleading. Not less misleading are their accounts of how we got the "Big Loaf."

HOW WE GOT THE "BIG LOAF."

Ask them how we got it. They will tell you: "Because Sir Robert Peel, the Conservative

INTENTIONAL SECOND EXPOSURE

DO THE RADICALS WANT A REMEDY?

In a leading article on November 21st, 1905, *The Daily News* (R.) says :—

"At last it seems as if the facts of unemployment were being brought home to the heart and mind of the nation. It was obvious that in yesterday's procession there were many workmen who might fairly be described as good-for-nothings. But the demonstration was on that account only the more serious. **How is it that the unemployed so often become good-for-nothing? The vital question at the moment is** not whether Mr. Balfour said this, or that, or the other, about tariff reform, but **what is the Liberal Party's remedy for social disorders. . . . IT IS THE BUSINESS OF LIBERAL STATESMEN TO SAY SOMETHING VERY MUCH MORE POSITIVE THAN 'I HAVE NO REMEDY,'** and if this is seriously to be the last word from the Liberal Front Bench, the reply of London will be the reply of the voice in Mr. Morley's meeting, 'You don't want a remedy.'"

Printed by Jas. Truscott & Son, Ltd., Suffolk Lane, E.C.

Published by the Conservative Publication Department, St. Stephen's Chambers, Westminster, S.W., in connection with the National Union and the Conservative Central Office (705).

(C.C.O. No. 562.)

THE STORY OF THE "BIG LOAF."

The fiscal proposals of the Unionist Party do not include a tax on food.

This has been stated again and again. But Radicals have listened with their deaf ear. They go on merrily raising the war-cry of the "Big Loaf," and accusing the Unionists of intentions to demolish it.

These are tactics that are purposely misleading. Not less misleading are their accounts of how we got the "Big Loaf."

HOW WE GOT THE "BIG LOAF."

Ask them how we got it. They will tell you: "Because Sir Robert Peel, the Conservative

Prime Minister, repealed the Corn Laws; because we have Free Imports?"

This is only partly the truth. The price of wheat did not greatly fall until years after the Repeal; sometimes it exceeded the price before the Repeal. It was not until more than thirty years after that event that we first had the "Big Loaf."

Clearly, the Repeal had less to do with it than Radicals assert. There were other causes. Causes that came from progress and invention. They were:—

(i.) THE GENERAL FALL OF PRICES.

All the world over, during the last twenty years the prices of necessities have fallen. To-day a workman can buy as much food with £5 as he could twenty-five years ago with £7. The price of bread has but fallen in accordance with the general trend of prices. It is the same in Protectionist countries.

(ii.) ABUNDANT SUPPLY.

Another cause of the "Big Loaf" is the abundant supply of wheat that is now put on the market.

During the last twenty-five years, the wheat lands of the United States have nearly doubled. In 1877, there were 26 million acres under wheat; in 1901, there were 50 million acres. The production during that period has more than doubled. It has increased from 364 million bushels to 748 million bushels.

The same thing has taken place in Canada. The acreage has increased from 2,300,000 in 1881 to 4,000,000 in 1902. The production has risen from 32 million bushels to 94 million bushels.

This enormous development has helped to bring down the price to its present low level. It has also done something else. It has driven away the dread of famine. Bad harvests are no longer to be feared. A poor crop in one quarter of the globe is quickly balanced, in these days of cheap and rapid transit, by a good crop in another.

(iii.) LOW FREIGHTS.

Freights have played an important part in the making of the "Big Loaf." Thirty years ago it

cost £13 13s. to send a ton of wheat from Chicago to Liverpool, now it costs 13s. 6d.

This fall commenced with the change of our ships from sails to steam; with the laying of the railroad through the wheat lands of America. As competition became keener the freights fell, and incidentally helped along the birth of the "Big Loaf."

THE FUTURE.

But what will the future bring? It is evident that we should keep one object in view—the encouragement of wheat growing, preferably in our own country and the Colonies.

For if we want to keep the loaf "big," we must have a steady flow of wheat coming into our markets. A flow that war, bad harvests, and pestilence cannot turn aside or influence.

VOTE FOR THE
UNIONIST CANDIDATE.

Published by the Conservative Publication Department, St. Stephen's Chambers, Westminster, S.W., in connection with the Conservative Central Office and the National Union.
Printed by Sir Joseph Causton & Sons, Limited, 9, Eastcheap, London, E.C.

N.U., No. 563.

The Radical Government
FOR SEPARATION

An Appeal
By PROFESSOR DICEY
to Unionist Free Traders.

In a Letter to the "SPECTATOR," of December 23, 1905, PROFESSOR A. V. DICEY, writes:—

THOUGH a Free Trader, I am still, above all things, a Unionist, and am convinced that the maintenance of the Union has never since 1886 been in greater peril than to-day. The grounds for my convictions may be thus summarized:—

(1) **The Prime Minister has, in the plainest language, stated his intention to pursue a policy which may lead towards Home Rule.** His speech at Stirling means this or it means nothing. To justify this assertion it will be necessary to quote all that he says of Home Rule, but for my present purpose it may suffice to call attention to a few words taken from his speech. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, as reported in the Times, says, when addressing an imaginary ardent Irish Nationalist, that his own wish is to see "the effective management of Irish affairs in the hands of a representative Irish authority," and intimates that he cannot expect Nationalists to accept any measure which **does not lead up to their "larger policy."** Can any one, whether he be a Nationalist or a Unionist,

sincerely doubt that a representative Irish authority having the effective management of Irish affairs **means an Irish Parliament**, or that the larger policy means **the establishment of a separate**, though it may be subordinate, **Parliament in Ireland?** Note further that the Premier, whilst he has given a pledge which may amply satisfy ardent Nationalists who desire Home Rule, has uttered **not a word which may assuage the fears of any Free-trader who still remembers that he is a Unionist. The Prime Minister is a Home-ruler; he has proclaimed his approval of a Home Rule policy.**

(2) A policy of Home Rule is not only more likely to succeed, but is also **more injurious to the whole United Kingdom** than the attempt to dissolve the Union and revive an Irish Parliament. A Home Rule policy will give to Great Britain none of those compensations which were offered by Mr. Gladstone's measure of 1886. It will, if successful, reproduce the very worst characteristic of the Home Rule Bill of 1893, for it must end in **the creation of an Irish Parliament for Irish affairs, combined with the retention of Irish Members at Westminster for the management or mismanagement of British affairs.** But the endeavour to confer Home Rule by instalments contains in it worse evils than these. It will renew or keep alive incessant agitation; it will make it difficult to carry out with fairness reforms which may well be required in the system of Irish administration, or in the working of the Land Acts. **It is a policy not of pacification, but of long lasting agitation; it is a policy not of reconciliation, but of irritation.**

VOTE FOR THE

Unionist Candidate

Published by the Conservative Publication Department, St. Stephen's Chambers, Westminster, S.W., in connection with the National Union and the Conservative Central Office. (1205)

Printed by Sir Joseph Causton & Sons, Limited, 9, Eastcheap, London, E.C.

END OF
TITLE